DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 722 UD 024 824

AUTHOR	Evans, Robert W.
TITLE	Bronson Settlement Review. Year One, 1984-1985. Report of the Facilitator.
INSTITUTION	Cincinnati Public Schools, Ohio.
PUB DATE	Mar 86
NOTE	387p.; Appendices contain small, broken type.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC16 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Students; Black Teachers; *Compliance (Legal); *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; Extracurricular Activities; Housing Discrimination; Public Schools; *Racial Balance; *Racial Bias; Standardized Tests; Suspension; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Ohio (Cincinnati)

ABSTRACT

The major goal in the settlement agreement of Mona Bronson, et al v. Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati, et al is continued significant progress in the reduction of racial isolation in the city's schools. In the first year of compliance with the agreement, data show that 26.8 percent of the goal has been attained in elementary schools, 17.9 percent in junior/middle schools, and 57.8 percent in senior high schools. As of December, 1984, Cincinnati Public Schools had 22 alternative programs, and nine exceeded the district guidelines for black enrollment. During the 1984-85 school year, 1,205 students participated in the open enrollment program, with a 97.6 percent black utilization rate. Data show that all schools but one are in compliance with the policy of providing a racial balance of teachers substantially approximating the balance of the teaching staff as a whole. A section on unbiased tests and policies contains a breakdown by race of students suspended and expelled and an assessment of bias in standardized testing. Recommendations for improving low-achieving schools are made. This is followed by a survey of secondary student participation in extracurricular activities which assessed the effects of open enrollment or transfer on participation. Finally, district/city housing activities that impact on racial isolation are described. Extensive appendices, which comparise more than half of the document, consist of the technical reports from which these conclusions were drawn. (CG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278722

BRONSON SETTLEMENT
1984-85

UD024824

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert W. Evans

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE BRONSON SETTLEMENT REVIEW

YEAR ONE 1984-85

Report of the Facilitator

The Cincinnati Public School District has completed year one of the settlement of the litigation styled MONA BRONSON, et al. v. Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati, et al. That settlement provides for the collection and analysis of reports and other pertinent information by the Facilitator. The following report is submitted in compliance with that section of the Settlement Agreement.

On May 24, 1974, the Cincinnati School Desegregation Litigation known as MONA BRONSON, et al. v. Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati, et al. was filed. February 16, 1984, nine years and nine months later, a tentative agreement was reached between and among the parties of the suit which established certain settlements to be attained by June 30, 1991. On June 27, 1984, the court issued a consent decree establishing that agreement as resolution of the litigation.

January 2, 1985, the Facilitator began his duties. On January 10, 1985, the court issued to the Community Task Force its charge, and on January 21, 1985, the first meeting was held. It is instructive to note the lapse of time between the acceptance of the settlement and the assembling of all its component parts. The district also began the 1984-85 school year with some decisions made prior to the Bronson settlement.

I believe the district, which under the terms of the settlement holds the major responsibility for the implementation of the settlement, has made reasonable progress in year one. The experience and knowledge gained during the initial year should enhance the district's efforts in this, year two.

A review of the component parts of the settlement follows.

1. Taeuber Index

The major goal of the agreement is the continued significant progress in the reduction of racial isolation to meet the goals of a Taeuber Index of 36.5 for all elementary schools, a Taeuber of 36 for all middle/junior high schools and a Taeuber of 34 for all senior high schools.

The following data summarize the improvements in racial balance since 1975-76.

GENERAL SYSTEM DATA

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	68,546	53,633	51,528
Percent Black Pupils	51.10%	57.33%	57.99%
Taeuber Index	67	52	45.8
Total Number of Schools	97	82	78
0% Black	3	0	0
100% Black	5	1	1
90% or More One Race	49	33	22
Within 20% of System Average	16	29	32
Within 15% of System Average	10	24	28
Within 10% of System Average	8	18	21

The Taeuber Index is a measure of racial integration in schools, and it quantifies the degree to which Black and White students are distributed evenly among individual schools. The value of this index ranges from 0 (total integration) to 100 (total segregation). Index values across time in the Cincinnati Public Schools follow.

TAEUBER INDEX VALUES ACROSS TIME

Elementary Schools

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	38,005	30,337	28,488
Percent Black Pupils	49.68%	56.74%	57.04%
Taeuber Index	73	57	49.6

Junior/Middle Schools

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	14,446	9,692	6,988
Percent Black Pupils	51.53%	55.28%	62.25%
Taeuber Index	67	47	43.4

Senior High Schools

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	15,272	12,776	15,334
Percent Black Pupils	54.36%	60.61%	58.04%
Taeuber Index	52	45	38.9

Reductions in the Taeuber Index between 1983-84 and the 1984-85 school year are summarized below, and a comparison is made with the size of reductions needed to reach the goals of the Settlement Agreement.

TAEUBER INDEX FOR CPS

	1991 GOAL	1983-84	1984-85	AMOUNT OF CHANGE	PERCENTAGE SETTLEMENT ATTAINED
ELEMENTARY	36.5	52.9	49.6	-3.3	20%
JUNIOR/MIDDLE	36.0	43.8	43.4	-0.4	5%
SENIOR HIGH	34.0	42.3	38.9	-3.4	41%

TAEUBER INDEX DATA

LEVEL	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	CHANGE 84-85 TO 85-86
ELEMENTARY	52.9	49.6	48.5	-1.1
JUNIOR/MIDDLE	43.8	43.4	42.4	-1.0
SENIOR HIGH	42.3	38.9	37.5	-1.4

SETTLEMENT GOAL ACCOMPLISHMENT TO DATE

LEVEL	DROP NEEDED FOR GOAL	83-84 TO 85-86 ACTUAL	% GOAL ATTAINED
ELEMENTARY	16.4	-4.4	26.8%
JUNIOR/MIDDLE	7.8	-1.4	17.9%
SENIOR HIGH	8.3	-4.8	57.8%

Taeuber Index data for the current school year 1985-86 show a reduction of approximately 1 at each level. The reduction of percentage of gain, while still positive in nature, should be instructive in regards to future actions by the district.

On September 12, 1985, at a dispute resolution hearing a question was raised about the treatment of data in the calculation of the Taeuber Index for the district. Those issues have been resolved and shared with the court. In general the resolution establishes the calculation of the Taeuber in two ways to determine if, in the future, some adjustment of the method used to calculate the Taeuber may need to be made.

The following tables show the percent of Black students in CPS buildings for 1984-85 and 1985-86.

PERCENT OF BLACK STUDENTS IN CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Elementary Schools 1984-85 System Average 57.04%

COLUMN A
Schools Having More Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Washburn	100.00%
Burton	99.79
South Avondale	99.76
Hoffman	99.41
Taft Elem.	98.73
Winton Terrace	98.43
Rockdale	98.35
Hays	98.30
Bond Hill	96.93
Windsor	96.36
Roll Hill	95.90
Millvale	94.36
Parham	93.12
Rothenberg	87.02
Swifton	85.80
Washington Park	82.73
Silverton	80.98
Heberle	80.14
Vine	79.71
Bramble	77.07
North Avondale	75.88
Winton Place	75.56
North Fairmount	71.65
Douglass	67.81
Pleasant Hill	67.76
Heinold	65.44
Pleasant Ridge	62.11
Chase	60.08
Roselawn/Condon	59.67
College Hill	57.56

The Taeuber Index will decrease one point in elementary schools if:

162 Black students move this way

→

or

122 white students move this way

←

COLUMN B
Schools Having Less Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Carson	2.21%
McKinley	4.08
Quebec Heights	5.85
Sayler Park	6.14
Oyler	7.55
Whittier	7.79
Mt. Washington	19.97
Covedale	23.59
Central Fairmount	24.81
Kirby Road	25.91
Midway	28.12
Westwood	28.12
Cheviot	29.80
Kilgour	30.39
Linwood	39.08
Fairview	44.07
Hartwell	44.20
Mt. Airy	46.74
Roosevelt	47.96
Sands	49.08
Carthage	52.21
Clifton	54.36
Anderson Place	55.33
Eastern Hills	55.95
Hyde Park	56.10
Losantiville	56.36
Woodford	56.59

PERCENT OF BLACK STUDENTS IN CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Senior High Schools 1984-85 System Average 58.04%

COLUMN A
Schools Having More Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Woodward	87.85%
Taft Sr. High	86.06
Hughes	85.31
Withrow	70.58
Aiken	65.47

The Taeuber Index will decrease one point in senior high schools if:

89 Black students move this way

→

or

64 white students move this way

←

COLUMN B
Schools Having Less Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Walnut Hills	31.14%
Western Hills	35.80
S.C.P.A.	45.53
C.A.P.E.	54.35

Junior High Schools 1984-85 System Average 62.25%

COLUMN A
Schools Having More Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Sawyer	93.78%
Merry	92.73
Bloom	90.39
Shroder	90.35
Crest Hills	88.21
Schwab	64.86

The Taeuber Index will decrease one point in junior high schools if:

44 Black students move this way

→

or

26 white students move this way

←

COLUMN B
Schools Having Less Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Roberts	10.95%
Dater	37.19
Gamble	51.14
Schiel	60.05
Peoples	61.54
Porter	61.95

PERCENT OF BLACK STUDENTS IN CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Elementary Schools 1985-86 System Average 57.48%

COLUMN A
Schools Having More Black Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Washburn	100.00%
Hoffman	100.00
South Avondale	99.75
Hays	99.24
Rockdale	99.05
Bond Hill	98.10
Windsor	97.27
Burton	96.72
Roll Hill	96.03
Taft Elementary	95.62
Millvale	93.92
Parham	92.84
Rothenberg	90.46
Winton Place	90.25
Washington Park	86.65
Silverton	83.70
Swifton	81.79
Vine	78.09
Douglass	75.26
Bramble	72.01
Heberle	71.91
Pleasant Hill	71.23
North Avondale	70.35
North Fairmount	69.62
Winton Terrace	67.16
Pleasant Ridge	64.57
Heinold	61.67
Roselawn/Condon	60.70
Hyde Park	59.12
Woodford	59.04
Losantiville	58.48
Chase	57.62
Anderson Place	57.56

The Taeuber Index will decrease one point in elementary schools if:

168 Black Students move this way

⟹

or

124 white students move this way

⟸

COLUMN B
Schools Having Less Black Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Carson	2.71%
McKinley	4.90
Whittier	8.03
Sayler Park	8.70
Oyler	9.05
Quebec Heights	9.43
Covedale	19.48
Mt. Washington	21.19
Westwood	23.89
Central Fairmount	26.42
Kirby Road	26.88
Midway	29.21
Kilgour	30.87
Cheviot	32.84
Linwood	38.14
Fairview	44.93
Mt. Airy	45.72
Hartwell	48.87
Roosevelt	49.89
Sands	49.92
Schiel	52.08
Eastern Hills	52.98
Clifton	56.01
Carthage	56.56
College Hill	56.64

PERCENT OF BLACK STUDENTS IN CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Senior High Schools 1985-86 System Average 59.34%

COLUMN A
Schools Having More Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Woodward	87.40%
Taft Sr. High	85.96
Hughes	80.29
Withrow	71.20
Aiken	67.50

The Taeuber Index will decrease one point in senior high schools if:

90 Black students move this way

⇒

or

61 white students move this way

⇐

COLUMN B
Schools Having Less Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Walnut Hills	31.93%
Western Hills	39.26
S.C.P.A.	45.79
C.A.P.E.	55.46

Junior High Schools 1985-86 System Average 62.06%

COLUMN A
Schools Having More Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Merry	92.52%
Bloom	91.33
Shroder	90.41
Crest Hills	84.69
Peoples	69.93
Schwab	66.83

The Taeuber Index will decrease one point in junior high schools if:

40 Black students move this way

⇒

or

25 white students move this way

⇐

COLUMN B
Schools Having Less Black
Students Than System Average

School	% Black
Roberts	13.68%
Dater	37.10
Gamble	54.61
Sawyer (CBA)	58.07
Porter	61.40

See the Interim Report of the Facilitator, July 1985, for a review of the computation of the Taeuber Index and the data for each school.

Appendix A contains the following:

Memberships, Number and Percent of Black Pupils by Schools
Dispute Resolution Agreement
Report on Special Transfers for 1983-84
Administrative Procedure 2650 Taeuber Calculation
Taeuber Applications and Decision Status

2. Alternative Schools

As of December 1984, CPS was conducting 22 alternative programs in 41 sites. Three schools offered two different programs. Two additional programs were implemented in the 1984-85 school year: an extended day program at Heberle and a computers unlimited program at Hughes High School. The 1985-86 school year has seen the addition of three new programs: primary arts enrichment, primary physical education, and the Academy of World Languages.

Figures for the 1984-85 school year show a total of 14,420 students enrolled in alternative schools. Blacks number 7,973, Whites 6,044, and others 403. The Black enrollment percentage was 55.3%.

Racial isolation has been defined in the Bronson agreement as schools which are 90% or more of one race in existing alternative programs and 80% or more in alternative programs established at new sites. The district has adopted a guideline of maintaining a 30% to 70% Black enrollment in each alternative program. With an overall Black enrollment of 58% these guidelines exceed the plus or minus 15 percent rule followed in most desegregation remedies.

During the 1984-85 school year, nine locations exceeded the district guidelines. Table 2, page 5, of the 1984-85 Evaluation of Alternative Programs, shows:

Table 2. Comparison of Percentages of Black Membership and Deviation from Guideline Range, December 1983 and December 1984.

Program/Location	December 1983		December 1984	
	% Black	% Deviation	% Black	% Deviation
Applied Arts Academy				
Oyler	18.6%	11.4%	13.2%	16.8%
Elementary College Preparatory				
Bond Hill	98.6	28.6	97.6	27.6
Burton	98.1	28.1	98.1	28.1
Pleasant Hill	75.9	5.9	67.7	NONE
Elementary Individually Guided Education				
North Avondale	96.3	26.3	91.7	21.7
Silverton	79.2	9.2	82.5	12.5
Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science				
Rockdale	96.6	26.6	85.2	15.2
French Bilingual				
Mt. Washington	28.1	1.9	28.3	1.7
Spanish Bilingual				
Swifton	72.3	2.3	66.3	NONE
Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics & Science				
Woodward (CAMAS)	77.3	7.3	78.5	8.5
Junior High College Readiness				
Shroder	92.5	22.5	85.9	15.9

While these programs at these locations tend to have been established some ten years ago in most cases and are not in violation of the Bronson agreement, some questions must be raised as to their status as alternatives. Admission procedures now generally establish racial balance enrollment procedures, and as a result raise the issue of two sets of alternative schools in the district.

The district is not unaware of the dichotomy here and has asked the Community Task Force, among others, for input. I would suggest that a clear community understanding of what an alternative is and the status of the neighborhood school will be central to the compliance issues to be faced in the future.

Examination of the evaluation of alternative programs' report for 1984-85 reveals the continuing pattern of achievement results. Data from standardized achievement tests in reading and mathematics show fewer alternative students as compared with non-alternative students in the below average stanine, about the same in the average stanine, and a greater percentage in the above average level. Additional test results show non-alternative students above alternative students in some areas, but both groups were down somewhat in reading and mathematics for the year. No conclusions can be drawn from these results at this time, but we will continue to observe these data.

New Alternatives 1985-86

1. C.A.P.E. Primary at Winton Terrace
2. Academy of World Languages at Schiel
3. Primary School for Arts Enrichment at Schiel
4. Cincinnati Bilingual Academy was moved from Schiel to Sawyer

New Alternatives 1984-85

1. Computers Unlimited at Hughes
2. Extended Day Program at Heberle

New Alternatives Being Phased in During 1984-85 and 1985-86 (Begun in 1983-84)

1. Montessori at North Avondale
2. French Bilingual at Mt. Washington
3. Spanish Bilingual at Cheviot

Alternative Program Locations by District Area, 1984-85.

Program Title	Number of Program Locations by Area		
	East	West	Total
*Applied Arts Academy	0	1	1
Elementary College Preparatory	4	2	6
Elementary Individually Guided Education	4	1	5
*Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science	1	0	1
*Extended Day Enrichment Program	0	1	1
French Bilingual	1	2	3
Fundamental Academy	1	1	2
*German Bilingual	1	0	1
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program	1	1	2
*Intermediate University Demonstration School	0	1	1
Montessori	1	1	2
*Multi-Age	0	1	1
*Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center	1	0	1
Spanish Bilingual	3	2	5
*Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics & Science	1	0	1
*Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education	0	1	1
*Cincinnati Bilingual Academy (Schiel)	0	1	1
*City-Wide Learning Community	0	1	1
*Computers Unlimited	0	1	1
*International Studies Academy	1	0	1
Junior High College Readiness	2	3	5
*School for Creative and Performing Arts	0	1	1
TOTAL	22	22	44

*Program located at one site only.

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM ENROLLMENT REPORT

December 5, 1985

SCHOOL/PROGRAM	BLACK	NON-BLACK	TOTAL	% BLACK
Bramble, IPSIP	50	48	98	51.0
Bond Hill, College Prep	81	3	84	96.4
Carthage, French Bilingual	169	141	310	54.6
Cheviot, Spanish Bilingual	114	183	297	38.4
College Hill, Fundamental Academy	291	232	523	55.6
Covedale, College Prep	67	174	241	27.8
Clifton, Multi-Age	334	304	638	52.4
Douglass, Reading/Language Arts	481	190	671	71.7
Burton, College Prep	48	1	49	98.0
Fairview, German Bilingual	224	298	522	42.9
Pleasant Hill, IPSIP	207	137	344	60.2
Pleasant Hill, College Prep	87	50	137	63.5
Midway, French Bilingual	102	171	273	37.4
Hartwell, Spanish Bilingual	129	102	231	55.8
Linwood, Fundamental Academy	116	193	309	37.5
Heberle, Extended Day	25	29	54	46.3
Anderson Place, College Prep	38	53	91	41.8
Mt. Airy, Spanish Bilingual	127	125	252	50.4
Mt. Washington, French Bilingual	60	228	288	20.8
North Avondale, I.G.E.	21	2	23	91.3
North Avondale, Montessori	178	132	310	57.4
Swifton, Spanish Bilingual	59	42	101	58.4
Pleasant Ridge, Spanish Bilingual	210	171	381	55.2
Rockdale, Math & Science Academy	79	4	83	95.2
Roselawn/Condon, College Prep	158	88	246	64.2
Silverton, I.G.E.	297	60	357	83.2
Sands, Montessori	309	329	638	48.4
Schiel, Primary Arts Enrichment	67	73	140	47.9
Schiel, Academy of World Languages	55	24	79	69.6

SCHOOL/PROGRAM	BLACK	NON-BLACK	TOTAL	% BLACK
Winton Terrace, Primary Physical Education	127	61	188	67.6
Oyler, Applied Arts Academy	16	66	82	19.5
Eastern Hills, I.G.E.	340	312	652	52.1
Woodford, I.G.E.	212	202	414	51.3
Chase, Demonstration School	398	301	699	56.9
Schwab, College Readiness	60	47	107	56.1
S. C. P. A.	506	614	1120	45.2
Sawyer, Bilingual Middle School	217	145	362	59.9
Shroder, College Readiness	52	9	61	85.2
Peoples, College Readiness	87	33	120	72.5
Heinold, I.G.E.	327	176	503	65.0
Porter, College Readiness	125	53	178	70.2
Dater, College Readiness	59	59	118	50.0
C. A. P. E.	661	562	1223	54.0
Hughes, City-Wide	60	32	92	65.2
Hughes, Computers Unlimited	142	156	298	47.7
Withrow, I.S.A.	370	196	566	65.4
Woodward, CAMAS	402	118	520	77.4

TOTALS:

BLACK	8,344
NON-BLACK	6,729
	15,073
OPEN ENROLLMENT	1,077
	16,150

Cincinnati Public Schools describes its alternative offerings as follows:

APPLIED ARTS ACADEMY

The Applied Arts Academy uses a hands-on approach to help youngsters in grades 4-6 acquire the awareness and the skills in fine and industrial arts, and to develop the individual character necessary to succeed in our technological world. In applied arts education, any specific skill or learning used in actual practice complements the strong program in basic skills. Whatever the topic--mathematics, history, reading, science--teachers include some application of that topic with their instruction so that students can see the connection between learning and the real world. A planned course of study stresses practical experiences that prepare students for a career in the work place.

BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

Cincinnati Public Schools' bilingual programs offer children the study of a foreign language and culture in Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish. Students learn one of these languages in a structured and challenging academic environment. Most bilingual programs enroll children in kindergarten or first grade. At this early age, students are introduced to the foreign language in its spoken or conversational form. During periods devoted to language study, no English is used, immersing students in the language and building listening skills.

When a parent and a child select a foreign language program in the Cincinnati Public Schools, the child is able to pursue the selected language from kindergarten through grade twelve. From kindergarten through grade five, children attend one of eleven elementary schools offering the foreign language program.

In grade six, children from all of the elementary bilingual programs may attend the Cincinnati Bilingual Academy. As scheduling permits, they continue to receive content area instruction in the second language. A truly international flavor exists at the middle school as students have cultural exposure and interaction with students who are studying other foreign languages.

The International Studies Academy is the choice of many students as they enter high school at grade nine. Here the global perspective of the students' educational program is strengthened through advanced training in foreign language and emphasis on world issues. Some students may elect the academically demanding International Baccalaureate Program which leads to a degree that is recognized in many countries around the world.

CHASE INTERMEDIATE DEMONSTRATION CENTER

Chase Intermediate Demonstration Center's close relationship with the University of Cincinnati gives this alternative program some distinct advantages. The large number of university students in the classroom lowers the ratio of students to adults. University professors teach classes, and put on demonstration lessons using effective and successful teaching techniques. Regular meetings and training sessions with the Chase staff and professors introduce fresh ideas and keep the Chase staff informed of the latest teaching strategies. Lessons are taught in traditional closed classrooms as well as in contemporary open instructional areas.

CINCINNATI ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE

The fields of science and engineering are highly competitive, produce jobs that are continually in demand, and provide many financial advantages. The Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics and Science's curriculum, therefore, is structured around three basic areas necessary to face these challenges - biomedical, engineering, and technical. The academy helps students acquire specific skills unique to science and mathematics by concentrating on these areas in other disciplines. As theories and concepts of science and mathematics are studied, related concepts in English, foreign languages, and social studies are examined. Classroom studies are supported by field trips, advanced equipment and supplies, summer employment, and advanced placement courses.

CINCINNATI ACADEMY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education (CAPE) offers students a strong academic program and an enthusiastic program of physical development. CAPE's academic program extends beyond the basics. Four years of English, three years of mathematics, science, and social studies, as well as foreign language, business, college preparatory, and advanced placement programs give students the knowledge, skills, and discipline necessary to pursue a college education. The physical development program emphasizes individual and dual sports. It is designed to give all students a chance to achieve through organized team athletics. Students participate in a variety of team sports, including football, volleyball, basketball, baseball, gymnastics, soccer, and archery.

CINCINNATI ACADEMY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION PRIMARY SCHOOL

A program in physical education is vital to the development of children and strongly enhances basic learning. The broad goals of the Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education Primary School are to develop students' learning skills and to increase body awareness, develop basic motor skills and coordination, build self-confidence, and provide opportunities for promoting good sportsmanship and self-expression. Students receive a general physical education period daily and a special physical education period every other day.

CITY-WIDE LEARNING COMMUNITY

This alternative program offers classes that are community-based using the resources of the city as information sources. Students study government by participating in pushing legislation through the Cincinnati City Council, and journalism by writing newspaper articles for publication. Flexible schedules allow for mentor learning and independent study, and enrollment in university classes for high school credit is available. Tele-conferencing reaches beyond the city. Experts such as government leaders and journalists from the national scene visit the City-Wide classroom to answer questions and share ideas through an amplified telephone and microphone.

COMPUTERS UNLIMITED

Students in the Computers Unlimited program use the computer as a tool for learning in order to live and work more effectively in today's computer oriented world. English, science, social studies, and mathematics are taught with the aid of computers. All students take introductory courses in basic programming and in several languages including Pascal, FORTRAN, and COBOL. They also learn to use practical applications of programming, such as word processing, information search and retrieval, and forecasting. As in all Cincinnati Public Schools, students are thoroughly trained in basic skills. Graduates are qualified to enter training positions in business and industry, or can continue into college-level computer science courses.

ELEMENTARY COLLEGE PREPARATORY

In the Elementary College Preparatory program, students of average or above average ability develop proficiency in the basics of reading, writing, and mathematics. Opportunities are provided in all areas of study to increase comprehension abilities and broaden critical reading and research skills. The study of Latin improves and expands English vocabulary and helps students gain an appreciation for our classical heritage. Students also receive accelerated instruction in the areas of science, social studies, oral and written communications, various art forms, and physical education. Students entering the program should be performing on an average or above average ability.

ELEMENTARY INDIVIDUALLY GUIDED EDUCATION (IGE)

The Individually Guided Education program, offered at five schools, gives children individual instruction and flexible programming to meet varying needs. This non-graded learning community, based on communication of staff-parent-children-community, offers broad learning experiences through a team effort in program planning. Each child is tested in reading and mathematics when he/she enters the program. Students then work individually, as well as in small groups of similar ability. Student progress is determined through regular testing and observations. Smaller class sizes and teacher aides allow teachers to address the needs of each child.

ELEMENTARY MATH AND SCIENCE ACADEMY

Students in this alternative program learn the basics they need to build upon when developing the skills necessary for our technological society. While daily lessons with a strong emphasis on mathematics and science are the major focus of the program, additional emphasis is placed on maintaining high skill levels in other basic areas. As mathematics and science concepts are taught, related social studies, reading and language arts, and health concepts are examined. Part of a special curriculum includes a collaboration with the Cincinnati Zoo. Once a week an instructor from the zoo conducts a life science course for students. They then visit the zoo to do follow-up investigations and research. Rockdale's Partner-in-Education, Children's Hospital Medical Center, works closely with the school providing up-to-date instruction in the science and medical fields.

EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM

The Extended Day program is designed to provide a safe, consistent environment for children of working parents before and after school hours. The program offers children learning activities which support the solid education of the regular academic program. The relaxed working atmosphere of the Extended Day program fosters special interests and talents and encourages academic achievement. The program helps children improve academically and grow socially, emotionally, and physically. Special highlights include academic activities, tutorial assistance, and enrichment activities in art, drama, and computer use.

FUNDAMENTAL ACADEMY

Three special features make the Fundamental Academy unique: 1) a strong basic instructional program in reading, writing, mathematics, and science; 2) a clearly defined code of conduct; and 3) a modified dress code. The program accepts children who thrive in a highly-structured environment, are reasonably well disciplined, have good work habits, complete homework assignments regularly, and have parents who understand and support the fundamental academy.

INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS AND SOCIAL IMPACT PROGRAM (IPSIP)

In the Individual Progress and Social Impact program, student development of social awareness and attitudes toward school, community, and self are stressed. The program is set up to provide interracial, intercultural understanding and enriching ethnic experiences. IPSIP's philosophy is based on the idea that children need a wide range of activities to acquire social perceptions and a positive self-image, in addition to the tools of learning. Reading and mathematics are stressed in the academic program. Human relations and parent involvement are part of the program.

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ACADEMY

The International Studies Academy at Withrow High School is based on the belief that an understanding of one's place in the world demands an international perspective. The program focuses on developing skills for critical thinking, improving skills for communication in mathematics, science, one's native language, foreign language, and the humanities.

The ISA has three components:

International Baccalaureate
(Preparation Grades 9-10; Advanced Study Grades 11-12)

This is an advanced placement program where students can earn advanced credits for up to one year at colleges and universities in Canada and the United States. The curriculum is that of a comprehensive high school liberal arts education. The IB offices in Geneva, Switzerland and Southhampton, Great Britain are responsible for program review and for preparing and grading all external examinations.

International Studies Program
(Grades 9-12)

For students of average or above average ability, the International Studies Program features include an emphasis on world literature, experience in the unified approach to mathematics, and a sequential study of natural and social sciences.

English As A Second Language

This program offers instruction for foreign born students with limited English proficiency. It provides classes to students from more than 15 different countries.

JUNIOR HIGH COLLEGE READINESS

Offered at five locations, the Junior High College Readiness program stresses the improvement in basic skills in mathematics and English and offers career orientation and development. The program is designed for children who want to enter a college preparatory program in high school, but need encouragement and individual attention to strengthen their basic skills. Self-contained classrooms and team teaching are part of the program. Students entering the program should be performing on at least an average or above average ability.

MONTESSORI

This teaching method, developed by Maria Montessori nearly 80 years ago, provides students with experiences in self-expression and exploration. The growth and development of the individual child, the whole child - within the social environment of the school - is emphasized. Children use many learning materials not common in traditional classrooms. The materials are designed so that children can use them on their own in an activity that is most interesting to them. Montessori education offers training in basic skills. The curriculum allows children to learn according to their needs, curiosities, and culture. The child receives both individual and group instruction and enrichment supporting the child's own discovery of his/her world.

MULTI-AGE, NON-GRADED

The Multi-Age program at Clifton School recognizes the benefits of educating children of different ages together according to their functional level. In this non-graded program, students work at grade level, above grade level, and below grade level, depending on each student's greatest need. The multi-age groupings, by levels in mathematics and reading, allow children to learn from each other as well as from a teacher. Multi-age education permits adjusting teaching methods to meet differing social, mental, and physical capabilities.

PRIMARY SCHOOL FOR ARTS ENRICHMENT

The Primary School for Arts Enrichment offers a strong academic program as well as a well-rounded program in art, music, movement, drama, and creative writing. The focus of the program, as in any primary program, is to develop broad learning skills, positive attitudes, and a basic foundation in reading and mathematics. The program provides opportunities for children to use their talents and creativity. Children receive instruction two periods a week from specialists in each portion of the arts program - visual arts, music, Suzuki violin, and physical education/movement and dance. The school is supported with musical instruments, special equipment, and supplies.

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS DEMONSTRATION CENTER

The Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center emphasizes the communication arts - reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The components of the program are (1) The Reading Intervention Center for those students who are experiencing reading difficulties and meet the established entry criteria; (2) EXCELL! for those students who require an enriched reading and mathematics curriculum; and (3) finally, an academic program emphasizing excellence in reading/language arts for all students. Opportunities abound for students to master and practice communications skills through such activities as a weekly school-wide broadcast, the Young Writers Exposition, The Great Books Program, and a quarterly literary magazine publishing students' writing. Students are exposed to experts in the area of communication through the visits of artists and the members of the Communication Arts Advisory Board. This intensive reading/language arts curriculum is supported by a strong mathematics and science program.

SCHOOL FOR THE CREATIVE AND PERFORMING ARTS

The School for the Creative and Performing Arts (SCPA) is a unique school where young people with special talents in the arts have the opportunity to develop their artistic skills and academic knowledge within the same school setting. SCPA's intensive intellectual, creative, and artistic programs help students acquire the self-discipline, integrity, physical and mental labor to succeed, not only as artists in competitive fields, but as professionals in other fields - architecture, computer science, medicine, and education. The school offers study in visual arts, dance, drama, music, and creative writing, as well as a strong basic instructional program that includes a full college preparatory curriculum. In 1984-85 SCPA was one of the schools selected to receive National recognition for merit by the U.S. Department of Education.

Appendix B includes:

The Evaluation of Alternative Programs for 1984-85 and 1983-84

A Description of the Methods Used to Inform Parents and Students of Alternatives

A Flow Chart for Developing Alternative Programs

3. Open Enrollment Program

The Open Enrollment Program of CPS provides an opportunity for parents to enroll their children in any school in the system so long as that enrollment does not increase racial isolation in either the sending or receiving school.

This program is now twelve years old. The Alternative School Program has been established and now provides the largest means of access to programs outside the neighborhood, but open enrollment continues to serve Cincinnati students. During the 1984-85 school year, 1,205 students participated in the program. The racial composition of these students was 97.6% Black and 2.4% White, which continues the trend of overwhelming Black utilization.

Appendix C contains:

The Open Enrollment Evaluation for 1984-85

Cumulative Report of Open Enrollment Transfers as of November 15, 1985

4. Staff Racial Balance

The Cincinnati Board of Education passed on January 14, 1974, a policy designed to provide a racial balance of teachers substantially approximating the balance of the teaching staff as a whole. Analysis of the data show the district to be in compliance in all schools except Sands Montessori. Steps have been taken to produce more minority Montessori teachers.

TEACHER EMPLOYMENT REPORT

	SEPT - JUNE 1984-85	SEPT - DEC 1985-86
MALE	71	75
FEMALE	358	209
WHITE	312	221
BLACK	107	54
OTHER	10	9
TOTAL	429	284

To comply with the Cincinnati Board of Education's resolution on teaching staff racial balance, it is the objective of the Staff Racial Ba[illegible] Program to have the ratio of Black and White teachers on the fac[illegible] each school be within plus or minus five percent of the ratio for [illegible] teachers in the district. Separate ratios are calculated for elementary and secondary schools. The method of calculation uses the number and percent of Black teachers in each school. The percent of Black teachers in the district for 1985-86 is thirty-four at the elementary and middle school level and twenty-eight at the junior and senior high school level. Each school is listed with the number of teachers on the staff, the number of Black teachers and the numbers needed to reach the minimum, mean, and maximum as defined by the Board's resolution. These three calculations are rounded to the nearest whole number.

EAST ELEMENTARY

School	Total Teaching Staff	Number of Black Teachers Assigned	Number of Black Teachers Needed for Racial Balance		
			Min.	Mean	Max.
Anderson Place	35	12	10	12	14
Bramble	17	6	5	6	7
Carthage	19	6	6	6	7
Douglass	36	12	10	12	14
Fairview	28	9	8	10	11
Hartwell	29	10	8	10	11
Hoffman	18	7	5	6	7
Hyde Park	19.5	6.5	6	7	8
Kilgour	15.5	4.5	4	5	6
Linwood	14.5	5	4	5	6
Losantiville	21	6	6	6	7
McKinley	14.5	6	4	5	6
Millvale	14.5	5.5	4	5	6
Pleasant Ridge	28	10	8	10	11
Rockdale	31	11.5	9	11	12
Roosevelt	15.5	5.5	4	5	6
Roselawn-Condon	22.6	7	7	8	9
Sands Montessori	32.5	4	9	11	13
Schiel	19	6	6	6	7
Silverton	24	9	7	8	9
South Avondale	19	6.5	6	6	7
Swifton	19.5	7	6	7	8
Woodford	20.5	7	6	7	8
Bond Hill	21	8	6	7	8
Burton	24.5	8	7	8	10
Eastern Hills	38	14	11	13	15
Mt. Washington	23	7.5	7	8	9
North Avondale	26.5	8	8	9	10
Parham	22.5	8.5	7	8	9
Taft Elementary	25	7.5	7	9	10
Vine	16.5	5	5	6	6
Windsor	15.5	4	4	5	6

WEST ELEMENTARY

School	Total Teaching Staff	Number of Black Teachers Assigned	Number of Black Teachers Needed for Racial Balance		
			Min.	Mean	Max.
Carson	20.5	7	6	7	8
Central Fairmount	24.5	7	7	8	10
Chase	33.8	12.5	10	11	13
Cheviot	21	7	6	7	8
Clifton	31	10	9	11	12
College Hill	21	6.5	6	7	8
Covedale	24	8.5	7	8	9
Heinold	39.5	15	11	13	15
Kirby Road	24	8	7	8	9
Midway	22	8.5	6	7	9
Mt. Airy	25.5	9	7	9	10
North Fairmount	19.5	6.5	6	7	8
Oyler	26.5	9	8	9	10
Pleasant Hill	28	8.5	8	10	11
Quebec Heights	34	10	9	11	12
Roll Hill	22.5	7.5	7	8	9
Sayler Park	19	6.5	6	6	7
Westwood	21.5	7	6	7	8
Whittier	32.5	10	9	11	12
Winton Place	23.5	8	7	8	9
Hays	24	7	7	8	9
Heberle	32	9.5	9	11	12
Rothenberg	28	9.5	8	10	11
Washburn	24	9	7	8	9
Washington Park	30	10	9	10	12

MIDDLE SCHOOLS

School	Total Teaching Staff	Number of Black Teachers Assigned	Number of Black Teachers Needed for Racial Balance		
			Min.	Mean	Max.
Crest Hills	25	9	7	9	10
Gamble	29	10	8	10	11
Merry	41	13	12	14	16
Peoples	43	13.5	12	15	17
Sawyer C.B.A.	21.5	8	6	7	8
Schwab	48.4	14	14	16	19

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

School	Total Teaching Staff	Number of Black Teachers Assigned	Number of Black Teachers Needed for Racial Balance		
			Min.	Mean	Max.
Bloom	34	11.5	8	10	11
Dater	42.5	10.5	10	12	14
Porter	30	8.5	7	8	10
Roberts	41	10	9	11	14
Shroder	20	5	5	6	7

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

School	Total Teaching Staff	Number of Black Teachers Assigned	Number of Black Teachers Needed for Racial Balance		
			Min.	Mean	Max.
Aiken	88.50	28	20	25	29
C.A.P.E.	61	19	14	17	20
Hughes	87.91	27	20	25	29
S.C.P.A.	50.18	13	12	14	17
Taft	57.91	18	13	16	19
Walnut Hills	92.50	22	21	26	31
Western Hills	116.27	28	27	32	38
Withrow	110.53	32	25	31	36
Woodward	82.69	25.67	19	23	27

Appendix D includes:

The District's Affirmative Action Program

An Analysis of Staff by Race and Sex

5. Unbiased Tests and Policies

Pursuant to item six of the agreement the district ad hoc discipline committee, with two members of the Community Task Force as participants, reviewed the district policies for needed changes. No recommendations were made for change in the policies for the 1985-86 school year.

Concern by all parties was expressed at the number and disproportionate aspects of the suspension patterns. The committee has chosen to meet quarterly throughout the school year to attempt to identify trends, analyze causes, and suggest remedies. The appendix contains a manuscript plan for that committee.

The charts below provide a statistical breakdown by race on students suspended and expelled for the past two years.

Suspensions 1984-85

	Black Students	White Students	Others	Total
Senior High Schools	3,058	1,156	10	4,224
Junior-Middle Schools	1,430	1,627	4	3,061
Elementary Schools	1,362	500	9	1,871
Total for School System	5,850	3,283	23	9,156

Suspensions 1983-84

	Black Students	White Students	Others	Total
Senior High Schools	2,959	1,322	5	4,286
Junior-Middle Schools	1,469	1,505	0	2,974
Elementary Schools	1,396	379	3	1,778
Total for School System	5,824	3,206	8	9,038

Expulsions 1984-85

	Black Students	White Students	Others	Total
Senior High Schools	159	61	0	220
Junior-Middle Schools	89	57	0	146
Elementary Schools	7	6	0	13
Total	255	124	0	379

Expulsions 1983-84

	Black Students	White Students	Others	Total
Senior High Schools	234	79	0	313
Junior-Middle Schools	122	51	0	173
Elementary Schools	13	2	0	15
Total	369	132	0	501

ASSESSMENT OF STANDARDIZED TESTING

The following is the narrative report of the district relative to its examination for bias in Cincinnati Public Schools' tests. The supportive data may be found in Appendix E.

Before providing evidence that the Cincinnati Public Schools' testing programs meet prevailing professional standards of fairness (race and gender equity) and are being used in accordance with such standards, a definition of bias and sources of bias is critical in addressing this issue of fairness in testing.

As noted in Exhibit A (pg. 139 of the document), "An achievement test is biased when it systematically produces unfair scores for a particular group, a result that can occur only if the test measures something somewhat different for that group than for others. For example, a reading comprehension test might function largely as a measure of the vocabulary for one ethnic group (for example black students) because of the large differences within the group in their knowledge of the words in the reading passages. In another ethnic group, almost all students might know most of the words. For the second group, the test would mainly be a measure of comprehension, as intended. Differences in scores would be erroneously attributed to differences in reading comprehension skills in the first instance but correctly so in the second. The test is therefore biased."

"Similarly, assume that two groups, A and B, are known to read with equal understanding when content and vocabulary are equally familiar to both of them. If a reading comprehension test is administered that has more words that are unfamiliar to Group A than to Group B, the students in Group A will consistently achieve lower scores on the test. This would lead to the faulty conclusion that Group A students have poorer reading comprehension skills. This test is also a biased test. Differential variation in students' familiarity with the content of a reading passage can have the same effect."

Regarding sources of bias, there are two possible sources. "The first can be found in the language and thought patterns of test authors and editors."

" A second source of bias may be the procedures used to try out test materials. The products of even the most skillful test writers and editors do not always work well, and no serious test publisher would produce a standardized test without extensive trials of the materials. Tryouts provide data for identifying stimulus materials and test items that should be revised or discarded and for selecting the best materials and items from among those tried out."

With this as background information, an analysis will be made in relation to the four major tests or testing programs used in the district and the efforts made locally and by the publishers to reduce any discernible bias stemming from the sources described above.

THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Local Initiatives--Review and Selection of the California Achievement Test.

As Table 1 reveals, an extensive examination of race and gender potential bias in the California Achievement Test (CAT), Circus Test, Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP), Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) and Science Research Associates Test (SRA) was made by a selective test review committee of Cincinnati Public Schools' administrators, teachers, and parents in April, 1979. The number of Cincinnati Public Schools' staff involved in the review was approximately 30.

Results given by the test publishers and validation by the selection committee were quite convincing that indeed the bias issue was studied by these test publishers, and the publishers' findings described bias to be minimized. As Table 1 reveals, the test selection committee looked at four questions to address the issue of bias in testing:

1. How was the content reviewed by the various test publishers for their respective batteries?
2. What degree of item pretesting was done with minorities?
3. What did the resulting statistical analysis of items look like?
4. What did the final form of the test look like?

Findings by the Cincinnati Public Schools' selection committee in relation to the CAT (the adopted system-wide test used in our system for grades 1-11) revealed:

1. The CAT test was reviewed by professionally active educators from minority groups.
2. An extra effort was made by the publisher (California Test Bureau/Mc-Graw Hill) to obtain an adequate black sample.
3. Items were statistically analyzed to determine if items were unfairly discriminating on race and sex.
4. The final form of the text was in fact constructive in adherence with the publisher's multi-ethnic and equal treatment of sexes guidelines.

Additional precautions to reduce bias in testing are taken by our testing section in the administration of the CAT. For example, extensive materials are produced for each school covering the critical issue of test administration, inservice, test security, etc. (See Exhibit C - Test Coordinators Handbook.)

Publisher's Initiatives--Test Construction and Review (See Exhibit A).

"The first and perhaps most important step toward minimizing bias in a test is to write and edit the content carefully. If writers and editors are sensitive to variations in the background and culture of those for whom the test is intended, fewer potentially biased items will be produced. To that end, guidelines for avoiding bias in test development were specified. Test writers were instructed to consider the background and viewpoints of disadvantaged students, especially those from black and Spanish-speaking families, and then to avoid writing any material not necessary to the purpose of the items that might bias the outcomes. The writers were also instructed to develop material that would represent a variety of ethnic and cultural interests.

"After the tests were written and edited, they were reviewed by representatives of various ethnic and cultural groups, including a number of black and Spanish-speaking reviewers from different parts of the country. Among the reviewers were teachers, content and curriculum experts, and specialists in the education of minority students. Comments of the reviewers were carefully considered in selecting and revising the materials to be included in the Standardization Edition of CAT C and D. Such a review procedure is particularly effective in detecting racism, stereotyping, other expressions of inappropriate attitudes. Although these phenomena are probably not the most common causes of biased results, they are nevertheless undesirable."

Publisher's Initiatives--Analysis of Data (See Exhibit B).

Two statistical analyses were performed. One was based on the results obtained when the publisher was trying out individual items to go into the test, and the second on the final version of the test. For the sake of brevity, and because methodology for both types of analysis was the same, attention on methodology will be given to the tryout and results of the analysis given for the final version (standardization sample) of the test.

Results given by the test publishers and validated by the selection committee were quite convincing that bias in these respective tests were analyzed and found to be minimized -- as Table 1 reveals, specifically in relation to CAT (the adopted system-wide test for our schools).

Analysis of Item Data. To provide data for item selection and/or revision, item tryouts were conducted. In order to avoid accentuating any residual ethnic bias in the items, besides using customary item selection procedures an additional step was taken; that is, item data for black students were examined separately. Thus, all tryout items went through two screenings. One used the standard tryout data, which included all individuals in the schools' sample. In the second screening, data for the black students were examined separately and were compared with the data for students identified as Other. The items which appeared biased or unsatisfactory for blacks were identified. The editors then used this information along with that from the standard analyses in constructing the final test.

The item statistics used as indicators of bias were principally (1) the point-biserial correlation, which shows the relation of items to category objective scores, and (2) grade-to-grade growth as shown by item difficulties.

The tryout data differed from the standardization data reported here in several ways. First, no effort was made in the tryout to draw a probability sample of the population. Therefore, the standardization groups are not only larger but also more heterogeneous. Second, the tryout data used were collected in the fall of 1975, whereas the standardization data are from the spring 1977 administration. Third, the items at most levels were tried out at three grades, and the sample was augmented by additional black cases in the upper two grades. For example, Level 15 was tried out in the fall in Grades 4, 5, and 6, the black sample being in Grades 5 and 6. However, the standardization data are spring scores from Grades 4 and 5 only.

CONCLUSIONS

The data presented support the following conclusions:

1. The amount of bias against minorities in the Tryout Edition of CAT C and D was probably small in most areas; the test materials functioned reasonably well for all groups at all levels, and the proportion of items labeled biased was small.
2. The use made of the data from a special black tryout sample reduced the amount of bias against blacks; more items that function well for blacks were used than would have been the case otherwise.
3. Some bias against blacks probably remains in the tests, since the item statistics look best for the Other group.
4. The amount of bias against Hispanics was reduced by the procedures; the item statistics for this group look at least as good as they do for the Black group.
5. Some bias against Hispanics probably remains in the test, since the item statistics look best for the Other group.
6. There are probably some items biased against the majority group, since items favoring blacks were not labeled biased.
7. The amount of bias in the Tryout Edition, the amount that this bias was reduced, and the amount remaining all vary by group, by level, and by normed section; all the tables show such variation.

Additional documentation on race and gender bias pertaining to the California Achievement Test (adopted test battery presently used in our city-wide testing program) can be found in Exhibits A and B attached. As can be ascertained from reviewing these two documents, much effort, testing, analyzing, and reviewing took place to assure that race and gender bias is minimized in the CAT.

MINIMUM COMPETENCY AND CIMS TESTING PROGRAM

Local Initiatives--Review and Selection of Minimum Competency and Cincinnati Instructional and Management System.

Following is a summary of the efforts carried out through Resource Planning and Development to insure race and gender equity regarding the Minimum Competencies and CIMS testing programs.

Minimum Competencies

During the development phase of the Minimum Competencies program (1978-81), a thorough review of all tests was conducted. Much of this work was accomplished through the formation of a Community Communication Council composed of parents and representatives of business, civic, and ethnic groups. A subcommittee of the CCC reviewed each test for overall quality, racial and ethnic bias, and gender stereotyping. The subcommittee examined such specifics as the balance of male/female names in the tests' textual material, and the inclusion of equitable roles concerning gender and race.

In addition, the graphics work on each test was reviewed to make sure that all pictures depicted a balanced number of males and females as well as persons of different races and cultural backgrounds.

CIMS Testing Program

Prior to the development of the CIMS test, criteria was established to insure that the tests would be free of cultural bias. The criteria used was as follows:

1. The writers were instructed to develop passages which showed a balance in male/female division and performances of activities.
2. A deliberate attempt was made to portray minority groups in a positive way.
3. All graphics had to reflect a balance of multi-ethnic, male/female characters.

After the test items were developed, they were further assessed by the instructional Supervisor and the Pilot Classroom teachers.

OTIS-LENNON MENTAL ABILITIES TEST

Local Initiatives--Test Selection.

Before adopting the Otis-Lennon Mental Abilities Test for system-wide use in grades 6 and 8, this battery along with others were circulated to supervising staff (procedure most often followed when any adoption is being considered) for their review and input regarding issues of race and gender equity. Results of their analysis approved the test to be used.

Publisher's Initiatives--Test Construction and Review.

Exhibit D contains publisher's documentation of the other major test battery used in the system--Otis-Lennon Mental Abilities Test (OLMAT). Since documentation could not be found directly from the literature, the writer asked the publisher to answer in writing the degree to which the battery accounts for race and gender bias. Exhibit D contains the answer--"...procedures, which were used with OLMAT and other tests, involved primarily editorial review at the item development, field testing, and test assembly stages." (See Exhibit D.) Before closing the analysis on this test, an important caveate is in order. In February of 1986, a new version of this test called the Otis-Lennon School Abilities Test will be piloted in our school system; and if results and reviews of race and gender bias are favorable, this newer version will be adopted to be used for testing in the 1986-87 school year.

Other Research Reviews

Exhibits E and F are examples of related studies continually reviewed by the Testing Section of Cincinnati Public Schools to not only keep abreast of current findings and methodologies in this important area of race and gender bias in testing, but also to critique tests before consideration would be given by committees in future discussions of new test adoptions.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

To assure race and gender equity in testing, formal procedures will be developed by June of 1986. Exhibit G is a management plan containing the details of the tasks involved. It is projected that once these detailed procedures are approved, they will be followed to the letter in any further test review and selection process for Cincinnati Public Schools.

Appendix E contains:

Discipline Committee Annual Report
The Management Plan for Central Discipline Committee
The Summary of Suspensions and Expulsions for 1984-85
The Supportive Data for the Test Bias Report

6. Isolation Within Buildings

The district is currently examining this issue. There exists presently no charges of discriminatory assignments or any reason to believe a problem will emerge in this area. The district is working toward the development of an instrument to measure student placement practices.

7. Improvements in Low-Achieving Schools

The evaluation of the low-achieving schools for 1984-85 shows:

1. Students in low-achieving schools made larger achievement gains in reading and mathematics than the average gains for students across the system during the 1984-85 school year.

2. Low-achieving schools as a group made considerable progress toward the stated program objective in reading while smaller but positive improvements were made in mathematics during the 1984-85 school year.

3. Since 1983, when these schools were selected on the basis of their percentage of students at or above the national norm in reading, they have made great improvements.

4. Despite the progress that has been made, most of the seven low-achieving schools still rank near the bottom of all elementary schools.

Goals

The goals of the Low-Achieving Schools Component are based upon the two goals which have governed the School Improvement Program:

1. Improved NCE performance over two consecutive years in both reading and mathematics with attainment of the system-wide NCE gain in the second year.
2. An annual percentage gain in achievement status in reading and matehmatics that will improve the school's initial rank in the district within three years.

The first goal is a standard applied to all schools in the School Improvement Program. It is a necessary accomplishment if the second goal is to be attained in schools designated as low-achieving schools for the settlement component.

Recommendations have been developed which translate the second goal into specific three-year achievement objectives. These recommendations will be discussed with principals of target schools and they in turn with their staffs and LSACs before they are officially adopted. The recommendations are as follows:

Three-Year Achievement Objectives

Reading - Low achieving schools on the average will show 15% gain in the percentage of students at or above the national norms in reading over the next three years.

Mathematics - Low achieving schools on the average will show 10% gain in the percentage of students at or above the national norms in mathematics over the next three years.

These objectives, if accomplished, will result in the target schools no longer being ranked as the lowest achieving schools in the district at the end of the 1986-87 school year.

Schools Participating

Seven elementary schools have been identified for participating in the Low-Achieving Schools Component. Test data for the 1982-83 school year was used to rank the schools in the district and the lowest seven schools in reading achievement were designated. The schools and the data are listed below:

	%	% at and Above Norm		NCE Gain		% of Mastery 3		Minimum Comp. 6	
Name of School	Black	Rdg.	Math.	Rdg.	Math.	Rdg.	Math.	Rdg.	Math.
Hoffman	99.5	15.8	14.3	-1.6	-1.7	81	58	78	54
Rothenberg	86.9	17.3	19.0	-3.2	-5.3	84	73	66	44
Hays	98.2	18.5	28.5	-1.0	-3.1	76	63	76	65
Heinold	61.1	19.6	23.9	-2.5	-3.7	83	75	76	55
Heberle	89.9	23.2	37.2	-0.4	+4.3	75	72	63	55
Windsor	97.5	23.2	23.1	+2.7	+0.9	78	51	67	49
Washington Park	82.2	26.8	38.8	+1.0	+4.0	70	56	82	75

Six of the low-achieving schools are currently part of the School Improvement Program. Hoffman, Rothenberg, Heinold, Heberle, and Windsor have participated since 1982 and Hays since 1983. Washington Park was added based upon its selection for the settlement component.

Basis for Program

The philosophic base for the program for school improvement in low-achieving schools is directly related to the "school effects" and "classroom effects research." A brief description of consistently cited characteristics of effective schools follows.

1. A Sense of Mission

Effective schools make a conscious decision to become effective schools and that is their mission. A collegial decision and commitment is made to assure minimum mastery of basic school skills for all pupils.

Pupil acquisition of basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities and, when necessary, school energy and resources are diverted from other activities to achieve that end.

2. Strong Building Leadership

Effective schools have principals who are, in fact, the instructional leaders of the staff. They are creative, bold, supportive, and dedicated to the mission of the school. They are active and involved with all parts of their educational community.

3. High Expectations for All Students and Staff

Effective schools expect teachers to teach and pupils to learn. Standards are high but realistic. No student is allowed to attain less than minimum mastery of the basic skills of the assigned level.

The teachers believe they have the ability to provide the required instructional program and that all students can master the basic skills they teach.

4. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

Effective schools have teachers and principals who are constantly aware of pupil progress in relationship to the instructional objectives.

Frequent monitoring of pupil progress may be as traditional as classroom testing on the day's lesson, or as advanced as criterion-referenced system-wide standardized testing measures.

5. A Positive Learning Climate

Effective schools have an atmosphere that is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional mission. The climate is warm and responsive, emphasizes cognitive development, is innovating, and provides a student support system.

6. Sufficient Opportunity for Learning

Effective schools emphasize more time on task. The more time spent in instruction, the greater the learning that takes place. Implications exist for improved use of time, individualized instruction, and curriculum content.

7. Parent/Community Involvement

Effective schools have broad support. Parents influence their children in a number of ways: through their expectations for the children, through their own involvement, and through direct instructions.

The district has identified 11 critical behaviors which are required to accomplish these characteristics and promote achievement in reading and mathematics:

1. Setting high expectations and standards
2. Planning for instruction
3. Increasing engaged learning time
4. Using effective teaching strategies
5. Demonstrating effective learning behaviors
6. Monitoring academic progress
7. Coordinating the instructional program
8. Improving discipline
9. Improving attendance
10. Improving communications
11. Improving human relations

Instruments and other strategies for assessing needs and observing progress in these areas is part of the development work associated with the project.

The planning process for the Low-Achieving Schools Component began with the formation of a central steering committee to meet with the principals and support and facilitate their efforts. The principals, with the involvement of their School Improvement Team, staff and LSACs, were asked to address three questions:

1. What are the obstacles to achieving the goals of improved achievement status in reading and mathematics?
2. What kind of program improvements are needed to achieve the goals?

3. What information or staff consultation do you need to assist you in your program planning?

With this information as input to the planning process, it was agreed that additional assistance was needed in low-achieving schools to provide the increased leadership that was necessary to improve the instructional program at the building level. Each school with the exception of one which has an assistant principal has added a teacher to provide this assistance and work with the principal to assure that the critical behaviors identified earlier are addressed in a responsible manner.

The second major part of the program was on the implementation of the Open Court Reading Program which has demonstrated significant gains in reading achievement in schools in which it has been used. The program format and strategies support directly the critical behaviors related to high expectations, planning, increasing engaged learning time, effective teaching strategies, effective learning behaviors, and monitoring academic progress. Open Court consultants worked with the principals and assisted in orientation sessions held in each school to inform staffs of the program and approaches and obtain their commitment.

Once these two major decisions had been made, a funding formula was agreed to which allotted the additional resources to address the most pressing needs as identified through the needs assessment referred to earlier.

The principals working with their school staffs and LSACs developed a program budget and a management plan for carrying out the effort. Program elements which are common among most of the schools in addition to increased instructional leadership and Open Court Reading Program include additional instructional support (both teachers and instructor assistants), staff development, and the extension of ECIA Chapter 1 program to focus on improving mathematics achievement of low-achieving students.

Specific Staff Development activities include:

Leadership Academy - August 7, 8, and 9
Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Leader Supervisor

Open Court Inservice - August 28 and 29
Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Leader Supervisor, Teachers of Reading, and Instructor Assistants

School Improvement Inservice - Variable based upon local plans
Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Leader Supervisor, and Instructional Staff.

Appendix F includes:

Low-Achieving Schools Evaluation

8. Extracurricular Activities

The district, at the request of the facilitator, conducted a study of secondary student participation in extracurricular activities. They examined the participation data to determine if transfer students in alternative or open enrollment situations were less active in extracurricular activities and what, if any, difference existed by race in the same circumstance.

The initial study results show:

1. More transfer students participate than do non-transfer students.
2. About 1 in 3 of all students take part in one or more extracurriculars.

3. At least 43% of the alternative students participate.
4. In schools which are both alternative and neighborhood, the transfer students participate at a higher rate than do neighborhood students.
5. On the whole, Black students participate at a slightly higher rate than non-Black--27% to 22%.

During year one no special transportation programs were in place. In September 1985, attempts were made to provide metro bus passes for participants in extracurricular programs. A number of problems have emerged and the issue continues to be addressed. Extracurricular participation as described in the study in Appendix G should only be enhanced as the transportation problems are solved.

Appendix G contains:

Extracurricular Study, 1984-85

9. District/City Housing Activities

The following report from the Cincinnati Public Schools summarizes the activities of the Cincinnati Public Schools and the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority for 1984-85.

1. In accordance with the Settlement Agreement, letters were sent to housing agencies informing them of the provisions of the Consent Decree and Settlement. We requested that they provide us with advance notice of proposed housing decisions.
2. A good working relationship was established with the City Planning Department which, even prior to the issuance of the Consent Decree, began to consult with us concerning housing proposals.

3. In 1984 we reviewed two major housing proposals.

   A. The City Housing Allocation Policy set out priority locations for new low income housing. The criteria established in this policy for determining priority housing locations include the racial balance of the elementary school serving the area.

   B. The City Housing Agenda was a package of ordinances and resolutions designed to stimulate housing investment in Cincinnati. It was judged that there was nothing in the package which would necessarily harm racial balance in the Cincinnati Public Schools.

4. Since 1984 we have received and reviewed a number of CMHA housing proposals. All of these proposals were for scattered site housing and most have been for single family units. We have responded to all such proposals indicating the probable impact on racial balance in the Cincinnati Public Schools of the proposals. Copies of this correspondence have been forwarded to Trudy Rauh of the NAACP and to the City Planning Department. It is our understanding that our responses are made available to the City Planning Commission, and are considered when the Planning Commission indicates its approval or disapproval. It is also our understanding that the CMHA is not bound by the decision of the City Planning Commission.

5. There has been very little housing activity over which we can have any influence, and it seems likely that this will continue to be the case.

Considerations

The following observations and suggestions are tendered only as they may encourage thinking and concern relative to some emerging issues.

1. Some definition or description of the end product should be shared with the community. What will the CPS look like in 1991? It appears as if form follows function. Is this the case? How will we know when we reach Camelot?

2. The district should consider the adoption of a policy of only approving those alternative enrollments which decrease the Taeuber Index. Taeuber positive and so-called Taeuber neutral moves should not be accepted.
3. The district may wish to consider a concept that the pool of alternative students is finite and the saturation point is near. The choice to be made by parents and students may need to be whether to enroll in an alternative program or a non-alternative program with non-alternative schools serving areas rather than neighborhoods.
4. The siting of alternative programs by application may need to be replaced by a more global view of district needs. The need to place some programs in certain areas of the city may outweigh what buildings do and do not apply to be program sites.
5. The massive number of applications for alternative programs and open enrollment as compared with the acceptance rate carries the potential for a community perceptual problem. If only 1 in 10 applicants are successful, the process will become suspect at some point in the future.

APPENDIX A

Evaluation
Branch

MEMBERSHIP, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOLS

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1984-85 and 1985-86

by: Joseph E. Timmons

November 12, 1985

Cincinnati Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The pupil data in this report were collected from schools during the first full week in October 1984 and 1985. The numbers of pupils reported represent average daily membership for the five days in the first full week in October, and were reported to the State Department of Education as the official count of pupils for State Foundation purposes.

The percentage of black pupils in Cincinnati schools in 1985 increased slightly to 58.41% from 57.99% last year. In elementary schools the percentage of black students increased from 57.04% in 1984 to 57.48% in 1985. In junior high and middle schools the percentage of black pupils decreased from 62.25% in 1984 to 62.06% in 1985. The percentage of black pupils in senior high schools increased from 58.04% in 1984 to 59.34% in 1985.

While the percentage of black pupils has increased slightly in the last two years, the total increase since 1980-81 has only been a little over one percentage point. This relative stability in the percentage of black students in the 1980's is markedly different from the trend in the 1970's when the percentage of black pupils was increasing by more than one percentage point per year.

The total pupil membership in the Cincinnati Public Schools has also stabilized since 1980. Pupil membership this year is 51,458, 70 pupils lower than last year. The pupil membership in elementary schools increased by 695 over last year as a result of larger birth cohorts, since 1977, now moving through primary grades. In contrast, pupil membership in secondary schools decreased by 748 as a result of smaller birth cohorts from the early to middle 1970's.

As the larger elementary grade cohorts move up through higher grade levels they will bring about a sustained increase of total membership into the 1990's.

The total membership is reported to the state in five racial/ethnic categories. The totals for these five groups are shown below:

	Amer. Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White	TOTAL
Number	25	438	130	30,059	20,806	51,458
Percent	.05%	.85%	.25%	58.41%	40.43%	

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1984-85 AND 1985-86

School	1984-85			1985-86		
	ADM Oct. 1-5 1984	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 7-11 1985	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils
Senior High Schools						
Aiken	1,891	1,238	65.47	1,794	1,211	67.50
C.A.P.E.	1,288	700	54.35	1,208	670	55.46
Hughes	1,280	1,092	85.31	1,502	1,206	80.29
S.C.P.A.	1,142	520	45.53	1,127	516	45.79
Robert Taft	703	605	86.06	634	545	85.96
Walnut Hills	2,460	766	31.14	2,396	765	31.93
Western Hills	2,707	969	35.80	2,519	989	39.26
Withrow	2,243	1,583	70.58	2,198	1,565	71.20
Woodward	1,630	1,432	87.85	1,682	1,470	87.40
Total Senior High	15,344	8,905	58.04	15,060	8,937	59.34
Junior High Schools and Middle Schools						
Bloom	614	555	90.39	565	516	91.33
Cinti. Bilingual/1	398	239	60.05	384	223	58.07
Crest Hills	526	464	88.21	490	415	84.69
Dater	812	302	37.19	814	302	37.10
Gamble	571	292	51.14	553	302	54.61
Merry	495	459	92.73	602	557	92.52
Peoples	637	392	61.54	705	493	69.93
Porter	410	254	61.95	443	272	61.40
Roberts	840	92	10.95	804	110	13.68
Sawyer/2	418	392	93.78	...	...	...
Schwab	925	600	64.86	820	548	66.83
Shroder	342	309	90.35	344	311	90.41
Total Jr. High	6,988	4,350	62.25	6,524	4,049	62.06

/1 Cincinnati Bilingual Academy was housed at Schiel in 1984-85 and at Sawyer in 1985-86.

/2 Closed as districted junior high school in June 1984. The building now houses the Cincinnati Bilingual Academy.

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1984-85 AND 1985-86

	1984-85			1985-86		
School	ADM Oct. 1-5 1984	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 7-11 1985	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupil
Elementary Schools						
Anderson Place	797	441	55.33	780	449	57.56
Bond Hill	488	473	96.93	473	464	98.10
Bramble	410	316	77.07	393	283	72.01
Burton	478	477	99.79	458	443	96.72
Carson	542	12	2.21	554	15	2.71
Carthage	385	201	52.21	389	220	56.56
Cent. Fairmount	528	131	24.81	530	140	26.42
Chase	754	453	60.08	715	412	57.62
Cheviot	500	149	29.80	475	156	32.84
Clifton	699	380	54.36	682	382	56.01
College Hill	542	312	57.56	535	303	56.64
Covedale	640	151	23.59	616	120	19.48
Douglass	643	436	67.81	663	499	75.26
Eastern Hills	647	362	55.95	672	356	52.98
Fairview	590	260	40.07	572	257	44.93
Hartwell	500	221	44.20	530	259	48.87
Hays	352	346	98.30	394	391	99.24
Heberle	559	448	80.14	566	407	71.91
Heinold	599	392	65.44	574	354	61.67
Hoffman	339	337	99.41	353	353	100.00
Hyde Park	385	216	56.10	362	214	59.12
Kilgour	385	117	30.39	392	121	30.87
Kirby Road	579	150	25.91	599	161	26.88
Linwood	325	127	39.08	312	119	38.14
Losantiville	346	195	56.36	330	193	58.48
McKinley	319	13	4.08	286	14	4.90
Midway	537	151	28.12	534	156	29.21
Millvale	319	301	94.36	296	278	93.92
Mt. Airy	659	308	46.74	678	310	45.72
Mt. Washington	581	116	19.97	604	128	21.19

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1984-85 AND 1985-86

	1984-85			1985-86		
School	ADM Oct. 1-5 1984	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 7-11 1985	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupil
Elementary Schools (continued)						
North Avondale	452	343	75.88	479	337	70.35
North Fairmount	381	273	71.65	372	259	69.62
Oyler	477	36	7.55	486	44	9.05
Parham	465	433	93.12	461	428	92.84
Pleasant Hill	580	393	67.76	650	463	71.23
Pleasant Ridge	615	382	62.11	635	410	64.57
Quebec Heights	735	43	5.85	806	76	9.43
Rockdale	606	596	98.35	634	628	99.05
Roll Hill	463	444	95.90	479	460	96.03
Roosevelt	319	153	47.96	435	217	49.89
Roselawn/Condon	672	401	59.67	659	400	60.70
Rothenberg	493	429	87.02	545	493	90.46
Sands	654	321	49.08	655	327	49.92
Sayler Park	472	29	6.14	506	44	8.70
Schiel/3	...	...	...	240	125	52.08
Silverton	468	379	80.98	460	385	83.70
South Avondale	411	410	99.76	403	402	99.75
Swifton	331	284	85.80	346	283	81.79
Taft	395	390	98.73	479	458	95.62
Vine	276	220	79.71	283	221	78.09
Washburn	551	551	100.00	564	564	100.00
Washington Park	556	460	82.73	532	461	86.65
Westwood	601	169	28.12	565	135	23.89
Whittier	770	60	7.79	760	61	8.03
Windsor	320	291	96.36	293	285	97.27
Winton Place	311	235	75.56	523	472	90.25
Winton Terrace C.A.P.E. Primary	318	313	98.43	201	135	67.16
Woodford	387	219	56.59	415	245	59.04
Total Elementary	28,488	16,249	57.04	29,183	16,775	57.48

/3 Schiel housed the Cincinnati Bilingual Academy in 1984-85, and now houses the Academy of World Languages and the Primary School for Arts Enrichment.

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1984-85 AND 1985-86

	1984-85			1985-86		
School	ADM Oct. 1-5 1984	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 7-11 1985	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupil
Allen House	43	27	62.79	34	10	29.41
Guilford	98	66	67.35	89	51	57.30
Hillcrest	124	80	64.52	130	61	46.92
Juv. Court Ctr.	100	46	46.00	94	51	54.26
McMillan Center	167	118	70.66	142	86	60.56
Children's Home	23	5	21.74	29	9	31.03
New Life Youth	4	3	75.00	6	4	66.67
Altercrest	12	6	50.00	15	7	46.67
Talbert House	8	0	0.00	15	2	13.33
Ch. Psych. Ctr.	23	5	21.74	23	4	17.39
C.C.D.D.	6	2	33.33	6	4	66.67
Hospitals	100	17	17.00	108	9	8.33
Total Special Schools	708	375	52.97	691	298	43.13
DISTRICT TOTAL	51,528	29,879	57.99	51,458	30,059	58.41

Evaluation
Branch

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOLS

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1983-84 AND 1984-85

by Joseph E. Timmons
Jack Lewis

October 31, 1984

Cincinnati Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOLS CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS 1983-84 AND 1984-85
October 31, 1984

This is the first year since 1966-67 that pupil membership in the Cincinnati Public Schools has been higher than the previous year. The total membership during the first full week in October this year was 51,528. This figure is 284 more than the corresponding figure last year of 51,244.

Since the 1981-82 school year pupil membership has been relatively stable. During most of 1970's pupil membership declined at a rate of roughly 4% to 5% a year. Between 1981 and 1983 pupil membership declined by less than 1%. There appear to be three major reasons for this dramatic change in the pupil membership trend.

Since 1977 the numbers of births in Cincinnati have been increasing. These birth increases are now showing up in larger kindergarten and primary grade classes. This year's kindergarten class is 138 pupils larger than the kindergarten class last year.

Second, fewer people have been moving out of the school district since 1980. The depressed housing market and the general economic recession between 1980 and 1983 limited opportunities for movement out of the district.

Third, there appears to be a growing public confidence in the effectiveness of the Cincinnati Public Schools. It is significant that the first passage of an additional tax levy since the 1960's occurred in June 1980. It was in the 1980-81 school year that the first indication of the changed membership trend appeared. This greater public confidence has resulted in a slightly larger percentage of all Cincinnati school children enrolling in public schools. In 1980 about 75% of the total school population was enrolled in public schools. In 1983-84 that percentage increased to 76.4%, and this year it was 76.7%.

For the fifth consecutive year the percentage of black pupils in the Cincinnati Public Schools has remained in the range of 57% to 58%. The percentage of black pupils this year is 57.99% up a little from the 57.43% of last year. The total membership is reported to the state and federal government in five racial/ethnic categories. The totals for each of these five groups are shown below:

	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White	Total
Number	21	394	91	29,879	21,143	51,528
Percent	.04%	.76%	.18%	57.99%	41.03%	

The recent stability in percentages of black and white students is in marked contrast with the trend established between 1960 and 1980, during which time the percentage of black students increased steadily by over one percentage point per year. The reasons for this new stability appear to be related to the reasons for the changed membership trend. Fewer pupils are leaving the system, either by moving out of the district or enrolling in private schools. Since the majority of pupils lost in these two ways are white, the decline in these losses tends to stabilize the relative proportions of black and white pupils.

In addition to the increase in pupil membership and the stabilization of racial composition, the data in this report confirm a continuing improvement in the racial balance of the schools in the Cincinnati School District. Since the mid 1970's the Taeuber Index, a measure of racial balance, has steadily improved. Again, this year, the Taeuber Index declined significantly to 45.8 from 48.2 for the total system last year. The improvement in racial balance was the result of expanding alternative programs, open enrollment and some continued effects of past school consolidations.

The following data summarize the improvements in racial balance since 1975-76.

General System Data

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	68,546	53,633	51,528
Percent Black Pupils	51.10%	57.33%	57.99%
Taeuber Index	67	52	45.8
Total Number of Schools	97	82	78
0% Black	3	0	0
100% Black	5	1	1
90% or More One Race	49	33	22
Within 20% of System Average	16	29	32
Within 15% of System Average	10	24	28
Within 10% of System Average	8	18	21

Reduction in the Taeuber Index

Very significant reductions in the Taeuber Index have occurred during the past ten years, and this trend has continued for the 1984-85 school year. The Taeuber Index is used widely as a measure of racial integration in schools, and it quantifies the degree to which Black and White students are distributed evenly among individual schools. The value of this index ranges from 0 (total integration) to 100 (total segregation). Index values across time in the Cincinnati Public Schools follow.

Taeuber Index Values Across Time

Elementary Schools

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	38,005	30,337	28,488
Percent Black Pupils	49.68%	56.74%	57.04%
Taeuber Index	73	57	49.6

Junior/Middle Schools

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	14,446	9,692	6,988
Percent Black Pupils	51.53%	55.28%	62.25%
Taeuber Index	67	47	43.4

Senior High Schools

	1975-76	1980-81	1984-85
Total Pupils	15,272	12,776	15,344
Percent Black Pupils	54.36%	60.61%	58.04%
Taeuber Index	52	45	38.9

Additional data regarding the 1984-85 Taeuber Index are presented in Section II of this report. These data indicate the contribution of each school to the system values for this index. Comparative data are shown for the previous school year.

The contribution of each school is determined by comparing racial balance at the school with system-wide racial balance figures. It can be seen that the sum of individual school contributions equals the index value for that school level. It should be noted that changes in school contributions across time are not related necessarily to changes in the Taeuber Index value for the system.

Reductions in the Taeuber Index between last year and the current school year are summarized below, and a comparison is made with the size of reductions needed to reach the goals of the Settlement Agreement.

TAEUBER INDEX FOR CPS

	1991 GOAL	1983-84	1984-85	AMOUNT OF CHANGE	PERCENTAGE SETTLEMENT ATTAINED
Elementary	36.5	52.9	49.6	-3.3	20%
Junior/Middle	36.0	43.8	43.4	-0.4	5%
Senior High	34.0	42.3	38.9	-3.4	41%

The observed reductions in the Taeuber Index have been due to the cumululative effect of several programs and actions. Among these are an increase of approximately 300 students in alternative programs, an increase of 100 students in open enrollment, and improvements in racial balance at 44 of our schools. The increase in alternative program enrollment is due largely to the addition of two new programs for the 1984-85 school year --Computers Unlimited at Hughes High School and the Extended Day Program at Heberle Elementary.

Among the 44 schools showing an improvement in racial balance, Western Hills, Hughes, Withrow, Crest Hills, Dater, and Gamble showed the largest changes. Small improvements were observed in many elementary schools.

Section 1

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1983-84 AND 1984-85

	1983-84			1984-85			
School	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	Number of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct.1-5 1984	School
Senior High Schools							**Senior High Schools**
Aiken	1,788	1,170	65.44	65.47	1,238	1,891	Aiken
C.A.P.E.	1,249	661	52.92	54.35	700	1,288	C.A.P.E.
Hughes	1,295	1,145	88.42	85.31	1,092	1,280	Hughes
S.C.P.A.	1,093	491	44.92	45.53	520	1,142	S.C.P.A.
Robert Taft	913	780	85.43	86.06	605	703	Robert Taft
Walnut Hills	2,586	835	32.29	31.14	766	2,460	Walnut Hills
Western Hills	2,733	814	29.78	35.80	969	2,707	Western Hills
Withrow	2,095	1,522	72.65	70.58	1,583	2,243	Withrow
Woodward	1,610	1,389	86.27	87.85	1,432	1,630	Woodward
Total Sr. High	15.362	8,807	57.33	58.04	8,905	15,344	Total Sr. High
Junior High Schools and Middle Schools							**Junior High Schools and Middle Schools**
Bloom	584	521	89.21	90.39	555	614	Bloom
Crest Hills	548	492	89.78	88.21	464	526	Crest Hills
Dater	854	290	33.96	37.19	302	812	Dater
Gamble	588	274	46.60	51.14	292	571	Gamble
Merry	490	459	93.67	92.73	459	495	Merry
Peoples	681	399	58.59	61.54	392	637	Peoples
Porter	438	257	58.68	61.95	254	410	Porter
Roberts	793	89	11.22	10.95	92	840	Roberts
Sawyer	442	418	94.57	93.78	392	418	Sawyer
Schiel	394	242	61.42	60.05	239	398	Schiel
Schwab	962	603	62.68	64.36	600	925	Schwab
Shroder	326	297	91.10	90.35	309	342	Shroder
Total Jr. High	7,100	4,341	61.14	62.25	4,350	6,988	Total Jr. High

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1983-84 AND 1984-85

1983-84				1984-85			
School	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	Number of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct.1-5 1984	School
Elementary Schools							Elementary Schools
Anderson Place	780	441	56.54	55.33	441	797	Anderson Place
Bond Hill	450	445	98.89	96.93	473	488	Bond Hill
Bramble	378	290	76.72	77.07	316	410	Bramble
Burton	448	445	99.33	99.79	477	478	Burton
Carson	532	9	1.69	2.21	12	542	Carson
Carthage	405	201	49.63	52.21	201	385	Carthage
Cent. Fairmount	523	102	19.50	24.81	131	528	Cent. Fairmount
Chase	791	479	60.56	60.08	453	754	Chase
Cheviot	415	102	24.58	29.80	149	500	Cheviot
Clifton	705	375	53.19	54.36	380	699	Clifton
College Hill	522	329	63.03	57.56	312	542	College Hill
Covedale	612	164	26.80	23.59	151	640	Covedale
Douglass	663	457	68.93	67.81	436	643	Douglass
Eastern Hills	572	292	51.05	55.95	362	647	Eastern Hills
Fairview	509	217	42.63	44.07	260	590	Fairview
Hartwell	482	194	40.25	44.20	221	500	Hartwell
Hays	388	383	98.71	98.30	346	352	Hays
Heberle	495	408	82.42	80.14	448	559	Heberle
Heinold	678	414	61.06	65.44	392	599	Heinold
Hoffman	345	343	99.42	99.41	337	339	Hoffman
Hyde Park	370	172	46.49	56.10	216	385	Hyde Park
Kilgour	384	107	27.86	30.39	117	385	Kilgour
Kirby Road	602	155	25.75	25.91	150	579	Kirby Road
Linwood	329	133	40.43	39.08	127	325	Linwood
Losantiville	331	169	51.06	56.36	195	346	Losantiville

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1983-84 AND 1984-85

	1983-84			1984-85			
School	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	Number of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct.1-5 1984	School
Elementary Schools (continued)							Elementary Schools (continued)
McKinley	313	12	3.83	4.08	13	319	McKinley
Midway	537	152	28.31	28.12	151	537	Midway
Millvale	286	283	98.95	94.36	301	319	Millvale
Mt. Airy	552	269	48.73	46.74	308	659	Mt. Airy
Mt. Washington	550	73	13.27	19.97	116	581	Mt. Washington
North Avondale	409	354	86.55	75.88	343	452	North Avondale
North Fairmount	339	254	74.93	71.65	273	381	North Fairmount
Oyler	516	30	5.81	7.55	36	477	Oyler
Parham	489	468	95.71	93.12	433	465	Parham
Pleasant Hill	546	391	71.61	67.76	393	580	Pleasant Hill
Pleasant Ridge	603	353	58.54	62.11	382	615	Pleasant Ridge
Quebec Heights	825	55	6.67	5.85	43	735	Quebec Heights
Rockdale	591	586	99.15	98.35	596	606	Rockdale
Roll Hill	487	459	94.25	95.90	444	463	Roll Hill
Roosevelt	316	128	40.51	47.96	153	319	Roosevelt
Roselawn/Condon	672	382	56.85	59.67	401	672	Roselawn/Condon
Rothenberg	479	421	87.89	87.02	429	493	Rothenberg
Sands	672	327	48.66	49.08	321	654	Sands
Sayler Park	469	19	4.05	6.14	29	472	Sayler Park
Silverton	455	390	85.71	80.98	379	468	Silverton
South Avondale	400	398	99.50	99.76	410	411	South Avondale
Swifton	330	281	85.15	85.80	284	331	Swifton
Taft	422	418	99.05	98.73	390	395	Taft
Vine	303	237	78.22	79.71	220	276	Vine
Washburn	547	547	100.00	100.00	551	551	Washburn

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1983-84 AND 1984-85

	1983-84			1984-85			
School	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	Number of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct.1-5 1984	School
Elementary Schools (continued)							**Elementary Schools (continued)**
Washington Park	591	489	82.74	82.73	460	556	Washington Park
Westwood	496	81	16.33	28.12	169	601	Westwood
Whittier	767	58	7.56	7.79	60	770	Whittier
Windsor	339	332	97.94	96.36	291	302	Windsor
Winton Place	362	276	76.24	75.56	235	311	Winton Place
Winton Terrace	336	334	99.40	98.43	313	318	Winton Terrace
Woodford	369	217	58.81	56.59	219	387	Woodford
Total Elementary	28,077	15,900	56.63	57.04	16,249	28,488	Total Elementary

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1983-84 AND 1984-85

	1983-84			1984-85			
School	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	Number of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Percent Of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct.1-5 1984	School
Special Schools							**Special Schools**
Allen House	68	41	60.29	62.79	27	43	Allen House
Guilford	79	54	68.35	67.35	66	98	Guilford
Hillcrest	112	70	62.50	64.52	80	124	Hillcrest
Juv. Court Ctr.	87	44	50.57	46.00	46	100	Juv. Court Ctr.
McMillan Center	164	122	74.39	70.66	118	167	McMillan Center
Children's Home	25	8	32.00	21.74	5	23	Children's Home
Children's Unit/1	14	9	64.29				
New Life Youth	10	5	50.00	75.00	3	4	New Life Youth
Altercrest	18	2	11.11	50.00	6	12	Altercrest
Talbert House	7	2	28.57	0.00	0	8	Talbert House
Ch. Psych. Ctr.	24	7	29.17	21.74	5	23	Ch. Psych. Ctr.
C.C.D.D.	4	3	75.00	33.33	2	6	C.C.D.D.
Hospitals	93	12	12.90	17.00	17	100	Hospitals
Total Special Schools	705	379	53.76	52.97	375	708	Total Special Schools
TOTAL	51,244	29,427	57.43	57.99	29,879	51,528	TOTAL

/1 Now a state institution.

Administrative Research
October 31, 1984

Approved:
Albert H. Rouse, Jr., Director
Evaluation Branch

Section II

CONTRIBUTION OF EACH SCHOOL TO THE TAEUBER INDEX

1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

School	Contributions to the Taeuber Index		
	1983-84	1984-85	Amount of Change
Anderson Place	0.0	0.1	+0.1
Bond Hill	1.4	2.0	+0.6
Bramble	0.6	0.6	0.0
Burton	1.4	1.2	-0.2
Carson	2.0	2.1	+0.1
Carthage	0.2	0.1	-0.1
Central Fairmount	1.4	1.2	-0.2
Chase	0.2	0.2	0.0
Cheviot	0.9	1.0	+0.1
Clifton	0.2	0.1	-0.1
College Hill	0.2	0.0	-0.2
Covedale	1.4	1.5	+0.1
Douglass	0.6	0.5	-0.1
Eastern Hills	0.2	0.1	-0.1
Fairview	0.5	0.6	+0.1
Hartwell	0.6	0.5	-0.1
Hays	1.2	1.1	-0.1
Heberle	0.9	0.9	0.0
Heinold	0.2	0.4	+0.2
Hoffman	1.1	1.0	-0.1
Hyde Park	0.3	0.0	-0.3
Kilgour	0.8	0.7	-0.1
Kirby Road	1.4	1.3	-0.1
Linwood	0.4	0.4	0.0
Losantiville	0.1	0.0	-0.1
McKinley	1.2	1.2	0.0
Midway	1.1	1.1	0.0
Millvale	0.9	0.9	0.0
Mt. Airy	0.3	0.5	+0.2

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (Continued)

	Contributions to the Taeuber Index		
School	1983-84	1984-85	Amount of Change
Mt. Washington	1.7	1.5	-0.2
North Avondale	0.9	0.6	-0.3
North Fairmount	0.5	0.4	-0.1
Oyler	1.9	1.7	-0.2
Parham	1.4	1.2	-0.2
Pleasant Hill	0.6	0.5	-0.1
Pleasant Ridge	0.1	0.2	+0.1
Quebec Heights	3.0	2.7	-0.3
Rockdale	1.9	1.8	-0.1
Roll Hill	1.3	1.3	0.0
Roosevelt	0.4	0.2	-0.2
Roselawn/Condon	0.0	0.1	+0.1
Rothenberg	1.1	1.0	-0.1
Sands Montessori	0.4	0.0	-0.4
Sayler Park	1.8	1.7	-0.1
Silverton	0.9	0.8	-0.1
South Avondale	1.3	1.3	0.0
Swifton	0.7	0.7	0.0
Taft	1.3	1.2	-0.1
Vine	0.5	0.5	0.0
Washburn	1.7	1.7	0.0
Washington Park	1.1	1.0	-0.1
Westwood	1.5	1.3	-0.2
Whittier	2.7	2.7	0.0
Windsor	1.0	0.8	-0.2
Winton Place	0.5	0.4	-0.1
Winton Terrace	1.0	1.0	0.0
Woodford	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTALS	52.9	49.6	-3.3

CONTRIBUTION OF EACH SCHOOL TO THE TAEUBER INDEX

1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

JUNIOR/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

School	Contributions to the Taeuber Index 1983-84	1984-85	Amount of Change
Bloom	4.9	5.3	+0.4
Crest Hills	4.7	4.1	-0.6
Dater	6.8	6.2	-0.6
Gamble	2.5	1.9	-0.6
Merry	4.7	4.6	-0.1
Peoples	0.5	0.2	-0.3
Porter	0.3	0.0	-0.3
Roberts	11.7	13.1	+1.4
Sawyer	4.4	4.0	-0.4
Schiel	0.0	0.3	+0.3
Schwab	0.4	0.8	+0.4
Shroder	2.9	2.9	0.0
TOTALS	43.8	43.4	-0.4

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

School	Contributions to the Taeuber Index 1983-84	1984-85	Amount of Change
Aiken	1.9	1.9	0.0
CAPE	0.7	0.6	-0.1
Hughes	5.4	4.7	-0.7
SCPA	1.8	1.9	+0.1
Taft, R.A.	3.4	2.7	-0.7
Walnut Hills	8.6	8.8	+0.2
Western Hills	10.0	8.1	-1.9
Withrow	4.3	3.7	-0.6
Woodward	6.2	6.5	+0.3
TOTALS	42.3	38.9	-3.4

Evaluation
Branch

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOLS
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1982-83 AND 1983-84

By Joseph E. Timmons

October 31, 1983

Cincinnati Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOLS
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1982-83 AND 1983-84
OCTOBER 31, 1983

The percentage of black pupils in the Cincinnati Public Schools this year is 57.43%, almost identical to last year's 57.45%. This is the fourth consecutive year that the percentage of black pupils has remained essentially the same, just over 57%. This stability is in marked contrast to the trend established in the 20 years between 1960 and 1980, during which time the percentage of black pupils rose steadily by a little over one percentage point per year.

This year's data were collected in terms of average daily membership for the first full week in October, in accordance with new state foundation membership reporting procedures. In previous years racial composition data were collected separately on the last day of the first full week in October.

The total membership figures reported here include relatively small numbers of pupils of racial/ethnic groups other than black and white. The racial composition of the school district is reported to the state and federal government in five racial/ethnic categories. The totals for each group are shown below:

	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White	Total
Number	30	346	111	29,427	21,330	51,244
Percent	.06%	.68%	.22%	57.43%	41.62%	

Improvement in Racial Balance

There has been a very significant improvement in racial balance in the Cincinnati School District over the last several years. The following tables summarize some of the significant facts relating to racial balance since the 1975-76 school year.

TABLE I. General System Data

	1975-76	1980-81	1983-84
Total Pupils	68,546	53,633	51,244
Percent Black Pupils	51.10%	57.33%	57.43%
Tauber Index /1	67	52	48

1/ The Tauber Index attempts to quantify the degree to which black and white students of a school system are disproportionately distributed among individual schools. The lower the Tauber Index the better the racial balance in a school system.

TABLE II. Number of Schools by Percentages of Black Pupils

	1975-76	1980-81	1983-84
Total Number of Schools	97	82	78
0% Black	3	0	0
100% Black	5	1	1
90% or More One Race	49	33	19
Within 20% of System Average	16	29	33
Within 15% of System Average	10	24	25
Within 10% of System Average	8	18	19

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1982-83 AND 1983-84

	1982-83			1983-84			
School	Total Oct. 8 1982	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	School
Senior High Schools							Senior High Schools
Aiken	1,928	1,256	65.15	65.44	1,170	1,788	Aiken
C.A.P.E.	1,127	535	47.51	52.92	661	1,249	C.A.P.E.
Hughes	1,574	1,399	88.88	88.42	1,145	1,295	Hughes
S.C.P.A.	1,053	513	48.72	44.92	491	1,093	S.C.P.A.
Robert Taft	776	668	86.08	85.43	780	913	Robert Taft
Walnut Hills	2,598	847	32.60	32.29	835	2,586	Walnut Hills
Western Hills	2,329	582	24.99	29.78	814	2,733	Western Hills
Withrow	2,185	1,581	72.36	72.65	1,522	2,095	Withrow
Woodward	1,620	1,383	85.37	86.27	1,389	1,610	Woodward
Total Sr. High	15,190	8,764	57.70	57.33	8,807	15,362	Total Sr. High
Junior High Schools and Middle Schools							Junior High Schools and Middle Schools
Bloom	557	495	88.87	89.21	521	584	Bloom
Crest Hills	470	412	87.66	89.78	492	548	Crest Hills
Dater	835	267	31.98	33.96	290	854	Dater
Gamble	695	260	37.41	46.60	274	588	Gamble
Merry	456	448	98.25	93.67	459	490	Merry
Peoples	692	391	56.50	58.59	399	681	Peoples
Porter	439	264	60.14	58.68	257	438	Porter
Roberts	839	90	10.73	11.22	89	793	Roberts
Sawyer	441	422	95.69	94.57	418	442	Sawyer
Schiel	402	226	56.22	61.42	242	394	Schiel
Schwab	912	564	61.84	62.68	603	962	Schwab
Shroder	292	264	90.41	91.10	297	326	Shroder
Total Jr. High	7,336	4,303	58.66	61.14	4,341	7,100	Total Jr. High

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1982-83 AND 1983-84

School	1982-83 Total Oct. 8 1982	1982-83 Number of Black Pupils	1982-83 Percent of Black Pupils	1983-84 Percent of Black Pupils	1983-84 Number of Black Pupils	1983-84 ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	School
Elementary Schools							**Elementary Schools**
Anderson Place	821	471	57.37	56.54	441	780	Anderson Place
Bond Hill	447	438	97.99	98.89	445	450	Bond Hill
Bramble	449	299	66.59	76.72	290	378	Bramble
Burton	433	430	99.31	99.33	445	448	Burton
Carson	518	13	2.51	1.69	9	532	Carson
Carthage	408	191	46.81	49.63	201	405	Carthage
Cent. Fairmount	575	105	18.26	19.50	102	523	Cent. Fairmount
Chase	892	538	60.31	60.56	479	791	Chase
Cheviot	481	100	20.79	24.58	102	415	Cheviot
Clifton	713	369	51.75	53.19	375	705	Clifton
College Hill	511	334	65.36	63.03	329	522	College Hill
Covedale	610	161	26.39	26.80	164	612	Covedale
Douglass	637	458	71.90	68.93	457	663	Douglass
Eastern Hills	459	202	44.01	51.05	292	572	Eastern Hills
Fairview	536	228	42.54	42.63	217	509	Fairview
Hartwell	480	176	36.67	40.25	194	482	Hartwell
Hays	439	431	98.18	98.71	383	388	Hays
Heberle	523	470	89.87	82.42	408	495	Heberle
Heinold	306	200	65.36	61.06	414	678	Heinold
Hoffman	401	399	99.50	99.42	343	345	Hoffman
Hyde Park	402	175	43.53	46.49	172	370	Hyde Park
Kilgour	421	99	23.52	27.86	107	384	Kilgour
Kirby Road	621	157	25.28	25.75	155	602	Kirby Road
Linwood	338	141	41.72	40.43	133	329	Linwood
Losantiville	323	165	51.08	51.06	169	331	Losantiville

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1982-83 AND 1983-84

	1982-83			1983-84			
School	Total Oct. 8 1982	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	School
Elementary Schools (Cont.)							Elementary Schools (Cont.)
McKinley	341	12	3.52	3.83	12	313	McKinley
Midway	550	144	26.18	28.31	152	537	Midway
Millvale	351	348	99.15	98.95	283	286	Millvale
Mt. Airy	578	251	43.86	48.73	269	552	Mt. Airy
Mt. Washington	450	13	2.89	13.27	73	550	Mt. Washington
North Avondale	508	488	96.06	86.55	354	409	North Avondale
North Fairmount	387	263	67.96	74.93	254	339	North Fairmount
Oyler	530	34	6.49	5.81	30	516	Oyler
Parham	541	514	95.01	95.71	468	489	Parham
Pleasant Hill	526	404	76.81	71.61	391	546	Pleasant Hill
Pleasant Ridge	639	361	56.49	58.54	353	603	Pleasant Ridge
Quebec Heights	802	43	5.36	6.67	55	825	Quebec Heights
Rockdale	600	597	99.50	99.15	586	591	Rockdale
Roll Hill	566	529	93.46	94.25	459	487	Roll Hill
Roosevelt	310	99	31.94	40.51	128	316	Roosevelt
Roselawn/Condon	677	365	53.91	56.85	382	672	Roselawn/Condon
Rothenberg	601	522	86.86	87.89	421	479	Rothenberg
Sands	672	346	51.49	48.66	327	672	Sands
Sayler Park	434	14	3.23	4.05	19	469	Sayler Park
Silverton	495	437	88.28	85.71	390	455	Silverton
South Avondale	440	436	99.09	99.50	398	400	South Avondale
Swifton	308	252	81.82	85.15	281	330	Swifton
Taft	491	486	98.98	99.05	418	422	Taft
Vine	356	262	73.60	78.22	237	303	Vine
Washburn	615	613	99.67	100.00	547	547	Washburn

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1982-83 AND 1983-84

	1982-83			1983-84			
School	Total Oct. 8 1982	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	School
Elementary Schools (Cont.)							Elementary Schools (Cont.)
Washington /1	524	262	50.00	...	...	...	Washington /1
Washington Park	612	503	82.19	82.74	489	591	Washington Park
Westwood	491	97	19.76	16.33	81	496	Westwood
Whittier	768	48	6.25	7.56	58	767	Whittier
Windsor	392	382	97.45	97.94	332	339	Windsor
Winton Place	397	288	72.54	76.24	276	362	Winton Place
Winton Terrace	434	431	99.31	99.40	334	336	Winton Terrace
Woodford	372	243	65.32	58.81	217	369	Woodford
Total Elementary	29,196 /2	16,637	56.98	56.63	15,900	28,077 /2	Total Elementary
Special Schools							Special Schools
Allen House	46	19	41.30	60.29	41	68	Allen House
Altercrest /3	...	...	...	11.11	2	18	Altercrest /3
C.C.D.D. /3	...	...	...	75.00	3	4	C.C.D.D. /3
Children's Home /3	...	...	...	32.00	8	25	Children's Home /3
Children's Psych. Center /3	...	...	...	29.17	7	24	Children's Psych. Center /3
Children's Unit /3	...	...	...	64.29	9	14	Children's Unit /3
Guilford	78	44	56.41	68.35	54	79	Guilford
Hillcrest	113	67	59.29	62.50	70	112	Hillcrest
Hospitals /3	...	...	...	12.90	12	93	Hospitals /3
Juvenile Court Center	86	37	43.02	50.57	44	87	Juvenile Court Center

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1982-83 AND 1983-84

	1982-83			1983-84			
School	Total Oct. 8 1982	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	ADM Oct. 3-7 1983	School
Special Schools (Cont.)							Special Schools (Cont.)
McMillan Center	126	99	78.57	74.39	122	164	McMillan Center
New Life for Youth [3]	...	...	...	50.00	5	10	New Life for Youth [3]
Talbert House [3]	...	...	...	28.57	2	7	Talbert House [3]
Total Special Schools	449	266	59.24	53.76	379	705	Total Special Schools
TOTAL	52,171	29,970	57.45	57.43	29,427	51,244	TOTAL

1/ School closed in December 1982.
2/ Elementary total and individual school totals include pre-school pupils in 1982, but not in 1983.
3/ These units reported through other schools in 1982.

Administrative Research
October 31, 1983

Approved:
Albert H. Rouse, Jr., Director
Evaluation Branch

Administrative Research Branch

APPENDIX A

Office of Management Services

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOLS
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79 AND 1979-80

Jean Krabacher
Joseph E. Timmons
October 31, 1979

Cincinnati Public Schools

INTRODUCTION

Each year the Administrative Research Branch produces a study showing the memberships, number and percentage of black pupils by school. This study is used by administrators in a variety of ways. In particular, the data are used in developing, implementing and evaluating programs to reduce racial isolation, such as open enrollment and alternative programs. The data are also important in developing building plans and in analyzing school districting alternatives.

In the tables that follow the total membership, number of black pupils and percentage of black pupils are presented for each school for the last two years. The data were collected in the schools by sight counts on October 6, 1978 and October 5, 1979. The "Percent of Black Pupils" was calculated in the Administrative Research Branch on the basis of the data submitted by the schools.

Significant Findings and Trends

The percentage of black pupils in the school system increased from 55.16% in 1978-79 to 56.25% this year. This continues the general trend of the last decade during which time the percentage of black pupils has tended to increase by a little more than one percentage point per year. Ten years ago, in 1969-70, 43.61% of the pupils in Cincinnati schools were black. Five years later, in 1974-75, this percentage had increased 50.51%. The numbers of both black and white pupils have declined since 1970-71. In that year there were 37,853 black pupils and 46,064 white pupils. This year the number of black pupils has dropped to 31,570 and the number of white pupils has fallen off to 24,263.

It should be noted that the total membership figures not only include black and white pupils, but also relatively small numbers of pupils from other racial/ethnic groups. This year there were a total of 13 American Indian pupils, 223 Asian pupils and 58 Hispanic pupils. These 294 pupils made up only .52% of the total membership. The total minority pupil membership (black pupils plus other racial/ethnic groups) is 31,864 which is 56.77% of the total membership.

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79 AND 1979-80

	1978-79			1979-80			
School	Total Oct. 6 1978	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	Total Oct. 5 1979	School
Senior High Schools							Senior High Schools
Aiken	1,700	992	58.35	59.40	1,251	2,106	Aiken
Hughes	2,283	2,014	88.22	88.60	1,818	2,052	Hughes
S.C.P.A. /1	477	251	52.62	50.10	250	499	S.C.P.A. /1
Robert Taft	767	724	94.39	91.18	713	782	Robert Taft
Walnut Hills	1,218	309	25.37	28.17	324	1,150	Walnut Hills
Western Hills	3,007	580	19.29	21.73	594	2,734	Western Hills
Withrow	2,133	1,571	73.65	71.97	1,407	1,955	Withrow
Woodward /2	2,113	1,798	85.09	86.31	1,665	1,929	Woodward /2
Total Sr. High	13,698	8,239	60.15	60.74	8,022	13,207	Total Sr. High
Junior High Schools and Middle Schools							Junior High Schools and Middle Schools
Bloom	413	390	94.43	90.72	626	690	Bloom
Campbell	446	382	85.65	...	...	...	Campbell
C.A.P.E. /3	...	...	...	47.47	206	434	C.A.P.E. /3
Crest Hills	662	489	73.87	84.62	484	572	Crest Hills
Dater	1,236	314	25.41	28.16	243	863	Dater
Eastern Hills	454	122	26.87	25.46	98	385	Eastern Hills
Gamble	833	141	16.93	23.02	180	782	Gamble
Heinold	438	371	84.70	72.40	341	471	Heinold
Lyon	530	398	75.09	73.30	335	457	Lyon
Merry	868	737	84.91	90.05	570	633	Merry
Peoples	722	293	40.58	51.88	359	692	Peoples
Porter	693	655	94.52	64.66	333	515	Porter
Roberts	909	60	6.60	8.80	76	864	Roberts

1/ Grades 9 - 12 only
2/ Includes CAMAS pupils
3/ Grades 4 - 8

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79 AND 1979-80

	1978-79			1979-80			
School	Total Oct. 6 1978	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	Total Oct. 5 1979	School
Junior High Schools and Middle Schools Cont.							Junior High Schools and Middle Schools Cont.
Sawyer	616	614	99.68	98.24	557	567	Sawyer
Schwab	1,174	547	46.59	59.21	614	1,037	Schwab
Shroder	452	369	81.64	83.73	350	418	Shroder
Walnut Hills	1,453	484	33.31	29.61	403	1,361	Walnut Hills
Total Jr. High	11,899	6,366	50.97	53.77	5,775	10,741	Total Jr. High
Elementary Schools							Elementary Schools
Bond Hill	481	464	96.47	96.71	470	486	Bond Hill
Bracken Woods	238	9	3.78	6.73	15	223	Bracken Woods
Bramble	396	268	67.68	66.12	240	363	Bramble
Burdett	181	181	100.00	...	...	...	Burdett
Burton	492	489	99.39	99.22	507	511	Burton
Carll	166	152	91.57	91.19	145	159	Carll
Carson	536	20	3.73	4.07	22	540	Carson
Carthage	337	57	16.91	29.09	105	361	Carthage
Cent. Fairmount	565	31	5.49	8.35	43	515	Cent. Fairmount
Chase	462	21	4.55	56.47	493	873	Chase Interm./4
Cheviot	451	0	0	0	0	393	Cheviot
Childrn's Hse., Cent., Heberle	124	55	44.35	...	...	...	Childrn's Hse., Cent., Heberle
Childrn's Hse., East, Mt. Adams	161	73	45.34	...	...	...	Childrn's Hse., East, Mt. Adams
Childrn's Hse., West, Oyler	167	82	49.10	...	...	...	Childrn's Hse., West, Oyler
Childrn's Hse., Sands	...	...	...	51.82	256	494	Childrn's Hse., Sands

---

4/ Chase Intermediate figures include those intermediate grade pupils from Chase elementary, Kirby Road, Winton Place and Winton Terrace who will be reassigned when the new Chase Intermediate building is opened later this school year.

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79 AND 1979-80

School	1978-79 Total Oct. 6 1978	1978-79 Number of Black Pupils	1978-79 Percent of Black Pupils	1979-80 Percent of Black Pupils	1979-80 Number of Black Pupils	1979-80 Total Oct. 5 1979	School
Elementary Schools Cont.							Elementary Schools Cont.
Clifton	698	375	53.73	53.83	351	652	Clifton
College Hill	445	247	55.51	58.55	274	468	College Hill
Columbian	330	327	99.09	...	...	...	Columbian
Covedale	524	87	16.60	28.69	169	589	Covedale
Cummins	325	320	98.46	100.00	318	318	Cummins
Douglass	347	332	95.68	98.28	343	349	Douglass
Eastern Hills	192	15	7.81	45.46	155	341	Eastern Hills
Eastwood	354	245	69.21	...	...	...	Eastwood
Evanston	193	184	95.34	...	...	...	Evanston
Fairview	448	186	41.52	42.12	227	539	Fairview
Garfield	319	295	92.48	...	...	...	Garfield
Hartwell	529	140	26.47	31.98	150	469	Hartwell
Hays	471	466	98.94	98.94	466	471	Hays
Heberle	384	311	80.99	88.40	564	638	Heberle
Highlands	189	34	17.99	...	...	...	Highlands
Hoffman	316	313	99.05	99.01	399	403	Hoffman
Hyde Park	409	107	26.16	29.85	120	402	Hyde Park
Kennedy	273	268	98.17	94.96	264	278	Kennedy
Kilgour	460	16	3.48	6.05	25	413	Kilgour
Kirby Road	602	179	29.73	19.56	125	639	Kirby Road 5/
Lincoln	228	24	10.53	9.60	24	250	Lincoln
Linwood	324	126	38.89	43.48	140	322	Linwood
Losantiville	394	137	34.77	45.81	186	406	Losantiville
Madisonville	566	519	91.70	92.41	475	514	Madisonville
McKinley	286	0	0	1.04	3	289	McKinley

5/ Kirby Road figures exclude intermediate grade pupils who will be reassigned to Chase Intermediate when that new building opens later this school year. Included in the Kirby Road figures are primary grade pupils from Chase elementary school.

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79 AND 1979-80

	1978-79			1979-80			
School	Total Oct. 6 1978	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	Total Oct. 5 1979	School
Elementary Schools Cont.							Elementary Schools Cont.
Midway	495	96	19.39	22.68	115	507	Midway
Millvale	421	414	98.34	98.53	403	409	Millvale
Mt. Airy	519	155	29.87	35.51	185	521	Mt. Airy
Mt. Washington	385	2	.52	.44	2	455	Mt. Washington
North Avondale	681	615	90.31	97.93	614	672	North Avondale
North Fairmount	450	334	74.22	79.64	313	393	North Fairmount
Oakley	614	50	8.14	19.39	121	624	Oakley
Osage	286	2	.70	...	...	...	Osage
Oyler	568	1	.18	4.00	19	475	Oyler
Parham	588	574	97.62	90.46	531	587	Parham
Peaslee	250	201	80.40	78.15	186	238	Peaslee
Pleasant Hill	568	410	72.18	76.97	381	495	Pleasant Hill
Pleasant Ridge	588	223	37.93	45.61	270	592	Pleasant Ridge
Quebec Heights	674	36	5.34	3.16	25	791	Quebec Heights
Riverside-Harrison	307	3	.98	2.31	6	260	Riverside-Harrison
Rockdale	561	553	98.57	99.20	618	623	Rockdale
Roll Hill	616	486	78.90	90.09	491	545	Roll Hill
Roosevelt	289	29	10.04	18.12	50	276	Roosevelt
Roselawn	376	205	54.52	59.26	256	432	Roselawn
Rothenberg	480	383	79.79	85.26	405	475	Rothenberg
Sands	312	312	100.00	...	...	...	Sands
Sayler Park	330	9	2.73	4.26	15	352	Sayler Park
Schiel	500	378	75.60	78.37	337	430	Schiel
S.C.P.A. 6/	581	308	53.01	53.07	320	603	S.C.P.A. 6/

6/ Grades 4 - 8 only

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79 AND 1979-80

School	1978-79 Total Oct. 6 1978	1978-79 Number of Black Pupils	1978-79 Percent of Black Pupils	1979-80 Percent of Black Pupils	1979-80 Number of Black Pupils	1979-80 Total Oct. 5 1979	School
Elementary Schools Cont.							Elementary Schools Cont.
Silverton	424	345	81.37	76.07	321	422	Silverton
South Avondale	306	306	100.00	100.00	388	388	South Avondale
Swifton	355	233	65.63	71.87	258	359	Swifton
Taft	592	575	97.13	94.62	580	613	Taft
Vine	453	278	61.37	73.57	295	401	Vine
Washburn	559	559	100.00	100.00	573	573	Washburn
Washington	561	201	35.83	46.13	310	672	Washington
Washington Park	695	502	72.23	76.29	518	679	Washington Park
Westwood	611	16	2.62	3.95	22	557	Westwood
Whittier	738	41	5.56	5.29	44	831	Whittier
Windsor	245	230	93.88	94.76	253	267	Windsor
Winton Place	667	456	68.37	71.01	289	407	Winton Place /7
Winton Terrace	925	911	98.49	98.80	575	582	Winton Terrace 7/
Woodford	283	261	92.23	91.26	240	263	Woodford
Total Elementary	33,216*	17,848	53.73	55.36	17,403	31,437*	Total Elementary

7/ Winton Place and Winton Terrace figures exclude intermediate grade pupils who will be reassigned to Chase Intermediate when that new building opens later this school year.

*Elementary total and individual school totals include pre-school pupils.

MEMBERSHIPS, NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BLACK PUPILS, BY SCHOOL
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79 AND 1979-70

School	1978-79 Total Oct. 6 1978	Number of Black Pupils	Percent of Black Pupils
Special Schools			
Allen House	58	36	62.07
Children's Psych. Center	61	27	44.26
Children's Unit	44	22	50.00
Condon /8	215	65	30.23
Guilford	99	64	64.65
Hillcrest	76	43	56.58
Juvenile Court Center	15	6	40.00
McMillan Ctr. /9	137	113	82.48
Total Special Schools	705	376	53.33
TOTAL	59,518*	32,829	55.16

1979-80 Percent of Black Pupils	Number of Black Pupils	Total Oct. 5 1979	School
			Special Schools
48.49	16	33	Allen House
49.21	31	63	Children's Psych. Center
37.78	17	45	Children's Unit
24.16	50	207	Condon /8
69.33	52	75	Guilford
46.67	42	90	Hillcrest
48.65	36	74	Juvenile Court Center
81.29	126	155	McMillan Ctr. /9
49.87	370	742	Total Special Schools
56.25	31,570	56,127*	TOTAL

8/ Includes: Children's Hospital, Convalescent Hospital, General Hospital, Good Samaritan Hospital, Home Instruction, Shrine Burns.

9/ Includes: McMillan Annex.

*Total includes pre-school pupils.

Administrative Research Branch
October 31, 1979

October 24, 1985

The Honorable Walter H. Rice
United States District Court
for the Southern District of
Ohio
Western Division
Dayton, OH 45402

Re: Bronson v. Board of Education

Dear Judge Rice:

This will supplement my letter of September 19 which reported on the status of efforts to resolve the concerns raised at the September 12 dispute resolution hearing.

The second meeting to address the Taeuber index methodology was held as scheduled on October 2 at 8:30 a.m. At that meeting, the parties agreed to certain procedures which, while not precluding the possible need for future consideration by the Court, eliminate the need for the Court's intervention at this time and which are summarized below.

Combination Buildings

Beginning with the 1985-86 school year and continuing thereafter for the term of the settlement agreement, Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS) will calculate the Taeuber Index by two methods:

> First, by continuing the methodology used since the 1980-81 school year which treats combination buildings as a single school unit without regard to the degree of interaction between alternative and traditional school students in that building, and,
>
> Second, by treating an alternative program and a traditional program located in a single building as separate schools if the racial populations of the alternative and traditional programs are divergently in variance from the racial composition of the district as a whole and students in the two programs are isolated from each other for more than half of the school day.

CPS will collect data on the enrollments and racial characteristics of alternative schools and programs concurrent with its October collection of such data for buildings generally. Where the degree of intra-school contact between students in combination buildings varies by grade level, the "half of the school day" test will be established by computing a weighted average across grade levels to include all alternative program students in the building.

For the 1984-85 school year, the difference in Index values between the first and second methods ranged from four tenths of one point (senior high and elementary schools) to two points (junior high schools). CPS believes that the first method should be used to measure progress toward satisfaction of the settlement agreement's Taeuber goals and Plaintiffs reserve the right to argue that the second method should be used. However, since both parties are hopeful that the Taeuber goals can be reached under either method, it is unnecessary for the Court to determine which method should be controlling under the settlement agreement. However, should the difference in the Index values obtained by the two methods increase significantly in subsequent years or should reasonable progress toward the settlement agreement goals not be demonstrated under the second method, then both parties reserve their right to present this issue for consideration by the Court at that time.

GRADE LEVEL GROUPINGS

At present in its Index computations, CPS classifies as senior high schools the entire population of buildings which may include grade levels outside of the traditionally defined range of this classification. However, the effect of regrouping this data to a traditional K-6, 7-9, and 10-12 taxonomy would not alter the total number of Taeuber transfers required to meet the Settlement goals. It is also somewhat illogical, despite the Settlement Agreement's language, to divide "non-combination" buildings into separate schools for purposes of the Index computations.

Therefore, the plaintiffs have withdrawn their objection to continuation by CPS of its present classification of school buildings for this purpose. Incoonsideration thereof, CPS will promptly provide to plaintiffs a written procedure by which the future classification of buildings whose grade level configuration differs from those presently extant will be determined during the remaining term of the Settlement Agreement.

CONCLUSION

These procedures, jointly developed by the parties, eliminate any present need for the Court to intervene in the Index computation. As to combination buildings, both parties believe in the propriety of their respective methods. However, unless it subsequently develops that the values obtained under these methods diverge significantly, there is no need for the Court to resolve this dispute. Indeed, the parties intend that CPS will be able to demonstrate a sufficient rate of progress toward the Taeuber Index goals so as to make this issue irrelevant.

Respectfully submitted,

G. David Schiering, Esq.
For Cincinnati Public Schools

Agreed:

Trudy D. Rauh, Esq.
For Plaintiffs

GDS/as

APPENDIX A

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE SENT : April 5, 1985

DATE REC'D

FILE

TO : Ed Spalter — Pupil Adjustment
NAME — SCHOOL OR OFFICE

FROM : Jack Lewis — Evaluation
NAME — SCHOOL OR OFFICE

REGARDING Report on Special Transfers for 1983-84

Thank you for your March 27 report showing the effect of the 1983-84 special transfers on the Taeuber Index. It is clear from the data you provided, that the overall effect of these transfers on the Taeuber Index is minimal. A small increase of about 0.3 points was observed, however, at the elementary school level.

I believe it will be necessary to prepare a similar report for 1984-85 and probably for each school year until we reach the goals established in the settlement agreement. It would be helpful if we could have the 1984-85 data by June 15 this year.

Thanks again for providing this information.

JL/dw

RECEIVED
APR 9 1985
PUPIL ADJUSTMENT

PUPIL ADJUSTMENT SECTION
GUIDANCE, PUPIL ADJUSTMENT AND CENSUS BRANCH
DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT SERVICES
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE: March 27, 1985

TO: Jack Lewis

FROM: ✓Ed Spalter ES

RE: Effect of Special Transfers (1983-84) on the Taeuber Index

627 special transfers were issued for the 1983-84 school year. 74% of these transfers had no effect on the Taeuber Index. The following chart shows the effect on the Taeuber at both the elementary and secondary levels.

Students Transferred 1983-84	Decreased Taeuber Index	Increased Taeuber Index	Neutral (No Change)
Black Elementary Students	34	34	185
White Elementary Students	11	46	164
Black Secondary Students	15	6	94
White Secondary Students	5	12	21
	65	98	464

ES:bb

cc: Henry Glaspie
Willis Holloway
Jack Snyder
Brinson Terry

PUPIL ADJUSTMENT SECTION
GUIDANCE, PUPIL ADJUSTMENT AND CENSUS BRANCH
DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT SERVICES
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE: June 4, 1985

TO: Jack Lewis

FROM: Ed Spalter

RE: Effect of Special Transfers (1984-85) on the Taeuber Index

673 special transfers were issued for the 1984-85 school year. 74% of these transfers had no effect on the Taeuber Index. In 1983-84 74% of the transfers also had no effect on the Taeuber Index. The following chart shows the effect on the Taeuber at both the elementary and secondary levels.

Students Transferred 1984-85	Decreased Taeuber Index	Increased Taeuber Index	Neutral (No Change)
Black Elementary Students	43	43	214
White Elementary Students	16	38	151
Black Secondary Students	6	18	105
White Secondary Students	3	8	28
TOTALS	68	107	498

ES:bb

cc: Henry Glaspie
Willis Holloway
Jack Snyder
Brinson Terry

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Office of the Superintendent

APPENDIX A

TO: Dr. Robert Evans

FROM: Raymond J. Brokamp

DATE: January 9, 1986

RE: Attached Administrative Procedure 2650

Attached to this memo will be found the procedure for defining school units and assigning school units to levels for the calculation of the Taeuber Index.

You will recall that in the letter of agreement transmitted to the district court on October 24, 1985, the Cincinnati Public Schools agreed to compute the Taeuber Index by "continuing the methodology used since the 1980-81 school year which treats combination buildings as a single school unit" and by treating "an alternative program located in a single building as a separate school" under conditions where "the programs are divergently at variance from the racial composition of the district as a whole and students in the two programs are isolated from each other for more than one-half of the school day."

The system also agreed to "provide to plaintiffs a written procedure by which the future classification of buildings whose grade level configuration differs from those presently extant will be determined during the remaining term of the Settlement Agreement."

Accordingly, please transmit Administrative Procedure 2650 to the members of the Communitywide Task Force.

Defining School Units and Assigning School Units to Levels for the Calculation of the Taeuber Index

Combination Buildings

Consistent with procedures in use since 1980-81, the Cincinnati Public Schools will, for its internal purposes, use the following rules to determine whether combination buildings are reported as one or more schools without regard to the amount of interaction between the students in the programs involved:

1. Two programs operated at a single site and administered by a single principal will be treated as a single school.
2. A single program under one principal which is operated at more than one site will be treated as separate schools.
3. Two programs operated at a single site but administered by two on-site principals will be treated as separate schools.

Grade Level Groupings

At present in its Index computations, Cincinnati Public Schools classifies as senior high schools the entire population of buildings which may include grade levels outside the traditionally defined range of this classfication. Instead of dividing "non-combination" buildings into separate schools for the purpose of the Index computations, the system provides the following procedure for the future classification of buildings whose grade level configuration differs from the traditional K-6, 7-9, and 10-12 taxonomy.

The procedure below is consistent with the practice used by the system since the 1981-82 school year.

1. A school will be assigned to an organizational pattern based on whether a greater number of grades fit it into the elementary (1-6), middle school (7-8), or senior high (9-12) configurations.
2. A school which develops year by year will change classifications when the proportion of grades tips from elementary to secondary.

Defining School Units and Assigning School Units to Levels for the Calculation of the Taeuber Index (continued)

3. If a particular school has equal numbers of grades in two classifications, then the school will be assigned to the higher grade-level group.

Department/Office Responsible
for Updating and Clarification:
SUPERINTENDENT

Approved: 1/7/86

APPENDIX A

Table 1. Breakdown of Alternative Program Applications by Date, Race, and Decision Status, 1985-86.

	Applications Received Before May 1		
Decision Status	Black	White	Totals
Accepted	1,810	1,429	3,239
Rejected	2,323	383	2,706
Totals	4,133	1,812	5,945
	Applications Received May 1 and Later		
	Black	White	Totals
Accepted	1,582	1,576	3,158
Rejected	2,706	439	3,145
Totals	4,288	2,015	6,303
Grand Totals	8,421	3,827	12,248

EB/12/85

Table 2. Alternative Program Applications by Taeuber Impact, Race, Application Period, and Decision Status, 1985-86.

Taeuber Increasing Applications

Decision Status	Received Before May 1			Received May 1 and Later		
	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total
Accepted	62	423	485	146	271	417
Rejected	100	159	259	230	157	387
Total	162	582	744	376	428	804

Taeuber Neutral Applications

Decision Status	Received Before May 1			Received May 1 and Later		
	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total
Accepted	915	883	1,798	1,160	1,056	2,216
Rejected	1,273	212	1,485	1,633	241	1,874
Total	2,188	1,095	3,283	2,793	1,297	4,090

Taeuber Decreasing Applications

Decision Status	Received Before May 1			Received May 1 and Later		
	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total
Accepted	833	123	956	276	249	525
Rejected	950	12	962	843	41	884
Total	1,783	135	1,918	1,119	290	1,409

EB/12/85

Table 3. Estimated Impact of Accepted Taeuber Increasing Applications on the Taeuber Index, 1985-86.

	Before May 1			May 1 and Later			
Level	Black	White	Total	Black	White	Total	Grand Totals
Elementary	+0.2	+1.7	+1.9	+0.8	+1.2	+2.0	+3.9
Junior/Middle	+0.1	+3.4	+3.5	0	+0.2	+0.2	+3.7
Senior High	+0.3	+2.2	+2.5	+0.2	+1.9	+2.1	+4.6
Totals	+0.6	+7.3	+7.9	+1.0	+3.3	+4.3	+12.2

EB/12/85

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Evaluation
Branch

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

1984-85

By Mary Gladden

October, 1985

Cincinnati Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ii

Introduction. 1

Program Evaluation
  Data Sources 2
  Enrollment and Location. 2
  Achievement Status 7
  Achievement Gains. 11
  Attitudes. 13
  Program Costs. 22

Summary 26

Tables

1. Alternative Program Membership Distribution and Percent of Black Students, December, 1984. 3
2. Comparison of Percentages of Black Membership and Deviation from Guideline Range, December, 1983 and December, 1984. . . . 5
3. Alternative Program Locations by District Area, 1984-85. 6
4. CAT Total Reading and Total Math Stanine Distribution and Percent At and Above National Norm for Alternative Programs by Location, April, 1985. 8
5. Comparison of California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Mathematics, Stanine Distribution for Alternative and Non-Alternative Groups, Grades 1-11, March - April, 1985 . . . 10
6. Normal Curve Equivalent Status and Gains, California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Matched and Promoted Alternative Students by Program and Location, April, 1984 and April, 1985. 12
7. Comparison of Mean NCE Gains for Alternative and Non-Alternative Students on the California Achievement Tests, Grades 2-11, April, 1984 and March - April, 1985. . . . 13
8. Student Ratings of Interracial Understanding, November, 1984 . . 14
9. Student Attitudes Toward School, November, 1984. 15
10. Student Attitudes Toward Safety and Discipline, November, 1984 . 16
11. Parent Ratings of Interracial Understanding, November, 1984. . . 17
12. Parent Attitudes Toward School, November, 1984 18
13. Parent Attitudes Toward Safety and Discipline, November, 1984. . 18
14. Teacher Ratings of Interracial Understanding, November, 1984 . . 20
15. Teacher Attitudes Toward School, November, 1984. 21
16. Teacher Attitudes Toward Safety and Discipline, November, 1984 . 22
17. Estimated Personnel Costs of Alternative Programs, 1984-85 . . . 23
18. Comparison of Non-Personnel Budget for Alternative Programs, 1983-84 and 1984-85. 25

Executive Summary

The data in this report indicate that 14,420 students attended alternative programs during the 1984-85 school year. The racial composition of these students was 55% Black, 42% white, and 3% of other races. The total number of students was 566 higher than the previous year's total. Of the 44 alternative programs, 35 fell within the racial balance guidelines established by the school system.

Results on standardized achievement tests in reading and mathematics show fewer alternative students as compared with non-alternative students in the below average stanines, approximately the same percentage in the average stanines, and a larger percentage of alternative students in the above average stanines. Additional test results indicate that non-alternative students did slightly better than alternative students and that neither achieved the expected achievement growth in either reading or mathematics.

Attitudinal survey data comparing alternative and non-alternative students, teachers, and parents reveal alternative groups giving higher positive responses to items concerning interracial understanding, attitudes toward school, and safety and discipline.

Estimated costs for excess teachers and instructional assistants during the 1984-85 school year were $4,087,282.03. The non-personnel budget allocation to alternative programs during the 1984-85 school year was $563,168.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS
1984-85

Introduction

For more than one hundred years, the neighborhood school to which children were assigned according to their places of residence was the dominant vehicle for schooling in the United States. Certainly, there have always been exceptions to this prevailing pattern: private and parochial schools, evening schools, and area vocational schools. For the majority of families, however, assignment to neighborhood public schools has been the norm.

During the last fifteen years, alternative programs have emerged in Cincinnati to provide additional options to attendance in neighborhood schools. As of December, 1984, there were 22 such programs in 41 schools. Three schools hosted two different programs. In 1984, two additions were made to alternative programs - an Extended Day program at Heberle and a Computers Unlimited program at Hughes High School for grades 9 and 10. Approximately 14,420 students in Cincinnati Public Schools now attend an alternative program. The voluntary nature of the alternatives creates a new structure for public education without forcing families into something they do not want. These programs were designed to provide specialized learning experiences along with the traditional academic curricula.

Since balanced racial composition is a primary goal, applications for entrance into an alternative program are received from students regardless of where they may reside in Cincinnati. Acceptance to the program is based primarily on racial balance, but students must also meet skill or achievement requirements for some programs.

The purpose of this report is to present a compilation of evaluation data related to alternative programs in the Cincinnati Public Schools during the 1984-85 school year. It is designed to assist in the decision-making processes related to these programs. Enrollment data, achievement status, achievement gains, attitude survey results, and estimated costs will be presented for the alternative programs functioning in the 1984-85 school year.

Program Evaluation

Data Sources

Data for this report have been obtained from various sources. Enrollment and racial composition are reported by the Alternative Programs Office in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. California Achievement Test data are maintained by the Testing Section of the Evaluation Branch. Attitude surveys are administered through the School Information Section of the Evaluation Branch. The Taeuber Index information comes from the Settlement Section of the Evaluation Branch. Cost figures are obtained from the Alternative Programs Office, the Personnel Office, and the Administrative Research Section of the Evaluation Branch.

Enrollment and Location

Enrollment and racial composition data as of December, 1984 are shown in Table 1. The source is enrollment data on file in the Alternative Programs Office at that time. These data indicate that a total of 14,420 students were enrolled in alternative programs. This was an increase of 566 students over enrollment in the 1983-84 school year. The racial composition of the 1984-85 alternative students was 55% Black, 42% white, and 3% of other races. These percentages were very similar to those for the previous three school years.

Table 1. Alternative Program Membership Distribution and Percent of Black Students, December, 1984.

Program/Location	Black	White	Other	Total	Percent Black
Applied Arts Academy					
Oyler (4-6)	15	97	2	114	13.2%
Elementary College Preparatory					
Anderson Place (4-6)	36	46	3	85	42.4
Bond Hill (4-6)	82	2	0	84	97.6
Burton (4-6)	51	1	0	52	98.1
Covedale (4-6)	76	149	3	228	33.3
Pleasant Hill (4-6)	67	30	2	99	67.7
Roselawn/Condon (4-8)	187	145	8	340	55.0
Elementary Individually Guided Education					
Eastern Hills (K-8)	302	255	3	560	53.9
Heinold (K-8)	342	191	2	535	63.9
North Avondale (3-6)	33	3	0	36	91.7
Silverton (K-6)	383	69	12	464	82.5
Woodford (K-3)	207	168	3	378	54.8
Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science					
Rockdale (4-6)	52	9	0	61	85.2
Extended Day Enrichment Program					
Heberle (K-6)	41	20	0	61	67.2
French Bilingual					
Carthage (K-5)	197	179	4	380	51.8
Midway (K-5)	109	146	12	267	40.8
Mt. Washington (K-2)	96	241	2	339	28.3
Fundamental Academy					
College Hill (K-6)	295	216	5	516	57.2
Linwood (K-6)	129	194	3	326	39.6
German Bilingual					
Fairview (K-5)	224	277	45	546	41.0
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program					
Bramble (K-3)	79	73	4	156	50.6
Pleasant Hill (K-3)	247	112	4	363	68.0
Intermediate University Demonstration School					
Chase (4-6)	415	284	1	700	59.3
Montessori					
North Avondale (K-2)	139	90	12	241	57.7
Sands (K-6)	314	329	10	653	48.1
Multi-Age					
Clifton (K-6)	356	250	55	661	53.9
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center					
Douglass (K-6)	400	192	17	609	65.7
Spanish Bilingual					
Cheviot (K-1)	89	145	2	236	37.7
Hartwell (K-5)	114	102	3	219	52.1
Mt. Airy (K-5)	124	112	10	246	50.4
Pleasant Ridge (K-5)	182	135	18	335	54.3
Swifton (K-5)	61	26	5	92	66.3
Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics & Science					
Woodward (CAMAS) (7-12)	344	89	5	438	78.5
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education					
CAPE (4-12)	680	557	3	1,240	54.8
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy					
Schiel (6-8)	231	119	40	390	59.2
City-Wide Learning Community					
Hughes (9-12)	65	28	0	93	69.9
Computers Unlimited					
Hughes (9-12)	40	55	0	95	42.1
International Studies Academy					
Withrow (9-12)	332	125	79	536	61.9
Junior High College Readiness					
Dater (7-9)	41	42	1	84	48.8
Peoples (7-8)	74	37	0	111	66.7
Porter (7-9)	107	47	0	154	69.5
Schwab (7-8)	58	59	3	120	48.3
Shroder (7-9)	55	9	0	64	85.9
School for Creative and Performing Arts					
SCPA (4-12)	502	589	22	1,113	45.1
TOTAL	7,973	6,044	403	14,420	55.3%

An effort was made in the enrollment of students for alternative programs to maintain a racial balance reflecting that of the school district. Admission procedures followed the general guidelines of maintaining a 30% to 70% Black membership in each program. For the 1984-85 school year, 35 (80%) of the 44 programs fell within these racial balance guidelines. This was a slight improvement over the previous school year when 74% of the programs met these guidelines.

Table 2 lists the alternative program locations that did not meet the guidelines of 30% to 70% Black membership in the 1983-84 or 1984-85 school year. These guidelines allow room for some deviation from the desired ratio of 50% Black. These data also show that programs in nine locations did not meet the racial requirement in both 1983-84 and 1984-85. These guidelines were not mandated by the school system, but alternative programs and schools were strongly encouraged to maintain racial balance. While it is possible to have a successful alternative program that does not meet racial balance guidelines, it is the goal of the school system that each alternative provide a quality, integrated education. All alternative programs were reviewed periodically with the view of improving racial balance.

Table 2. Comparison of Percentages of Black Membership and Deviation from Guideline Range, December, 1983 and December, 1984.

Program/Location	December 1983		December 1984	
	% Black	% Deviation	% Black	% Deviation
Applied Arts Academy				
Oyler	18.6%	11.4%	13.2%	16.8%
Elementary College Preparatory				
Bond Hill	98.6	28.6	97.6	27.6
Burton	98.1	28.1	98.1	28.1
Pleasant Hill	75.9	5.9	67.7	NONE
Elementary Individually Guided Education				
North Avondale	96.3	26.3	91.7	21.7
Silverton	79.2	9.2	82.5	12.5
Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science				
Rockdale	96.6	26.6	85.2	15.2
French Bilingual				
Mt. Washington	28.1	1.9	28.3	1.7
Spanish Bilingual				
Swifton	72.3	2.3	66.3	NONE
Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics & Science				
Woodward (CAMAS)	77.3	7.3	78.5	8.5
Junior High College Readiness				
Shroder	92.5	22.5	85.9	15.9

Table 3 is a summary of program locations by area of the city. The data show that there were five single-location programs being operated in the eastern area of the city and nine in the west. Programs with multiple locations were well distributed through the district. For the purposes of this report, Vine Street was used as the line dividing the eastern and western area locations.

Table 3. Alternative Program Locations by District Area, 1984-85.

Program Title	Number of Program Locations by Area		
	East	West	Total
*Applied Arts Academy	0	1	1
Elementary College Preparatory	4	2	6
Elementary Individually Guided Education	4	1	5
*Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science	1	0	1
*Extended Day Enrichment Program	0	1	1
French Bilingual	1	2	3
Fundamental Academy	1	1	2
*German Bilingual	1	0	1
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program	1	1	2
*Intermediate University Demonstration School	0	1	1
Montessori	1	1	2
*Multi-Age	0	1	1
*Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center	1	0	1
Spanish Bilingual	3	2	5
*Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics & Science	1	0	1
*Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education	0	1	1
*Cincinnati Bilingual Academy (Schiel)	0	1	1
*City-Wide Learning Community	0	1	1
*Computers Unlimited	0	1	1
*International Studies Academy	1	0	1
Junior High College Readiness	2	3	5
*School for Creative and Performing Arts	0	1	1
TOTAL	22	22	44

* Program located at one site only.

Achievement Status

California Achievement Tests were administered in April, 1985 to all students in grades 1 through 11, including students in alternative programs. Computerized analyses of the test data made it possible to determine results separately for alternative program students and non-alternative students. Table 4 shows the numbers and percentages of alternative program students whose scores attained or exceeded the "national norm" and those whose scores fall into three stanine categories - below average (stanines 1, 2, and 3), average (stanines 4, 5, and 6), and above average (stanines 7, 8, and 9). The data presented are based on total reading and total mathematics scores.

Table 4. CAT Total Reading and Total Math Stanine Distribution and Percent At and Above National Norm for Alternative Programs by Location, April, 1985.

Program/Location		Stanine Category						At and Above National Norm Total Program N (%)	
		Below Average (1-3) N (%)		Average (4-6) N (%)		Above Average (7-9) N (%)			
		TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM
Applied Arts Academy									
Oyler	(4-6)	27 (30.0%)	34 (39.1%)	55 (61.1%)	48 (55.2%)	8 (8.9%)	5 (5.7%)	22 (24.4%)	18 (20.7%)
Elementary College Preparatory									
Anderson Place	(4-6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	15 (18.8)	6 (7.4)	65 (81.3)	75 (92.6)	79 (98.8)	79 (97.5)
Bond Hill	(4-6)	0 (0.0)	3 (3.5)	64 (74.4)	60 (69.8)	22 (25.6)	23 (26.7)	69 (80.2)	68 (79.1)
Burton	(4-6)	1 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	41 (80.4)	27 (52.9)	9 (17.6)	24 (47.1)	27 (52.9)	46 (90.2)
Covedale	(4-6)	2 (0.9)	1 (0.5)	125 (57.1)	96 (43.8)	92 (42.0)	122 (55.7)	183 (83.6)	194 (88.6)
Pleasant Hill	(4-6)	3 (3.0)	4 (4.0)	60 (59.4)	42 (41.6)	38 (37.6)	55 (54.5)	75 (74.3)	87 (86.1)
Roselawn/Condon	(4-8)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	142 (57.0)	130 (52.0)	106 (42.6)	119 (47.6)	228 (91.6)	224 (89.6)
Elementary Individually Guided Education									
Eastern Hills	(1-8)	85 (17.7)	75 (15.7)	330 (68.6)	327 (68.3)	66 (13.7)	77 (16.1)	209 (43.5)	240 (50.1)
Heinold	(1-8)	129 (28.0)	101 (22.2)	304 (65.9)	300 (65.9)	28 (6.1)	54 (11.9)	133 (28.9)	182 (40.0)
North Avondale	(3-6)	25 (14.6)	19 (11.1)	124 (72.5)	125 (73.1)	22 (12.9)	27 (15.8)	77 (45.0)	91 (53.2)
Silverton	(1-6)	27 (8.2)	35 (10.7)	232 (70.3)	203 (61.9)	71 (21.5)	90 (27.4)	183 (55.5)	204 (62.2)
Woodford	(1-3)	13 (5.1)	17 (6.7)	118 (46.6)	111 (43.7)	122 (48.2)	126 (49.6)	192 (75.9)	197 (77.6)
Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science									
Rockdale	(4-6)	7 (11.5)	4 (6.8)	45 (73.8)	41 (69.5)	9 (14.8)	14 (23.7)	36 (59.0)	34 (57.6)
Extended Day Enrichment Program									
Heberle	(1-6)	5 (15.2)	3 (9.1)	21 (63.6)	24 (72.7)	7 (21.2)	6 (18.2)	22 (66.7)	18 (54.5)
French Bilingual									
Carthage	(1-5)	35 (14.2)	20 (8.2)	158 (64.0)	144 (58.8)	54 (21.9)	81 (33.1)	134 (54.3)	183 (74.7)
Midway	(1-5)	17 (8.4)	12 (5.9)	107 (53.0)	100 (49.0)	78 (38.6)	92 (45.1)	144 (71.3)	157 (77.0)
Mt. Washington	(1-2)	9 (5.7)	6 (3.9)	70 (44.3)	58 (37.4)	79 (50.0)	91 (58.7)	118 (74.7)	133 (85.8)
Fundamental Academy									
College Hill	(1-6)	30 (7.8)	32 (8.3)	234 (60.5)	232 (60.3)	123 (31.8)	121 (31.4)	248 (64.1)	272 (70.6)
Linwood	(1-6)	15 (5.6)	22 (8.2)	176 (65.2)	162 (60.2)	79 (29.3)	85 (31.6)	177 (65.6)	201 (74.7)
German Bilingual									
Fairview	(1-5)	19 (4.8)	17 (4.3)	198 (49.7)	180 (45.7)	181 (45.5)	197 (50.0)	320 (80.4)	334 (84.8)
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program									
Bramble	(1-3)	7 (9.2)	17 (22.4)	48 (63.2)	50 (65.8)	21 (27.6)	9 (11.8)	45 (59.2)	38 (50.0)
Pleasant Hill	(1-3)	27 (12.3)	32 (14.3)	126 (57.5)	103 (46.2)	66 (30.1)	88 (39.5)	133 (60.7)	151 (67.7)
Intermediate University Demonstration School									
Chase	(4-6)	155 (22.2)	143 (20.8)	478 (68.6)	469 (68.3)	64 (9.2)	75 (10.9)	239 (34.3)	263 (38.3)
Montessori									
North Avondale	(1-2)	13 (8.1)	15 (9.4)	86 (53.4)	74 (46.5)	62 (38.5)	70 (44.0)	124 (77.0)	116 (73.0)
Sands	(1-6)	35 (6.5)	34 (6.3)	289 (53.4)	277 (51.4)	217 (40.1)	228 (42.3)	372 (68.8)	409 (75.9)

Table 4. (Continued)

Program/Location		Stanine Category						At and Above National Norm Total Program N (%)	
		Below Average (1-3) N (%)		Average (4-6) N (%)		Above Average (7-9) N (%)			
		TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM
Multi-Age									
Clifton	(1-6)	81 (14.6%)	75 (13.7%)	310 (56.1%)	296 (54.0%)	162 (29.3%)	177 (32.3%)	327 (59.1%)	335 (61.1%)
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center									
Douglass	(1-6)	52 (13.7)	72 (19.2)	238 (62.6)	231 (61.6)	90 (23.7)	72 (19.2)	212 (55.6)	180 (48.0)
Spanish Bilingual									
Cheviot	(1)	17 (23.3)	16 (22.2)	48 (65.8)	43 (59.7)	8 (11.0)	13 (18.1)	32 (43.8)	37 (51.4)
Hartwell	(1-5)	6 (3.9)	7 (4.6)	75 (49.3)	78 (51.3)	71 (46.7)	67 (44.1)	118 (77.6)	122 (80.3)
Mt. Airy	(1-5)	4 (2.4)	10 (5.9)	102 (60.0)	94 (55.6)	64 (37.6)	65 (38.5)	130 (76.5)	126 (74.6)
Pleasant Ridge	(1-5)	12 (5.3)	13 (5.8)	126 (56.0)	114 (50.7)	87 (38.7)	98 (43.6)	167 (74.2)	179 (79.6)
Swifton	(1-5)	6 (9.0)	3 (4.4)	41 (61.2)	47 (69.1)	20 (29.9)	18 (26.5)	47 (70.1)	50 (73.5)
Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics & Science									
Woodward (CAMAS)	(7-11)	35 (9.7)	9 (2.5)	292 (80.7)	279 (76.6)	35 (9.7)	76 (20.9)	206 (56.9)	264 (72.5)
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education									
CAPE	(4-11)	201 (20.3)	127 (12.9)	693 (70.7)	750 (76.2)	88 (8.9)	107 (10.9)	374 (37.9)	424 (43.1)
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy									
Schiel	(6-8)	20 (5.9)	14 (4.2)	224 (66.1)	227 (67.6)	95 (28.0)	95 (28.3)	225 (67.6)	248 (73.8)
City-Wide Learning Community									
Hughes	(9-11)	22 (40.7)	20 (37.0)	27 (50.0)	33 (61.1)	5 (9.3)	1 (1.9)	11 (20.4)	12 (22.2)
Computers Unlimited									
Hughes	(9-11)	6 (6.7)	3 (3.3)	64 (71.1)	67 (74.4)	20 (22.2)	20 (22.2)	64 (71.1)	61 (67.8)
International Studies Academy									
Withrow	(9-11)	26 (8.1)	18 (5.8)	240 (74.5)	233 (75.4)	56 (17.4)	58 (18.8)	199 (61.8)	186 (60.2)
Junior High College Readiness									
Dater	(7-9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	61 (78.2)	57 (74.0)	17 (21.8)	20 (26.0)	63 (80.8)	67 (87.0)
Peoples	(7-8)	2 (1.9)	4 (3.8)	77 (74.0)	81 (77.1)	25 (24.0)	20 (19.0)	81 (77.9)	77 (73.3)
Porter	(7-9)	25 (17.5)	21 (14.8)	111 (77.6)	116 (81.7)	7 (4.9)	5 (3.5)	56 (39.2)	48 (33.8)
Schwab	(7-8)	3 (2.6)	12 (10.5)	104 (89.7)	89 (78.1)	9 (7.8)	13 (11.4)	83 (71.6)	70 (61.4)
Shroder	(7-9)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	48 (80.0)	27 (45.0)	11 (18.3)	33 (55.0)	42 (70.0)	53 (98.3)
School for Creative and Performing Arts									
SCPA	(4-11)	25 (2.7)	23 (2.5)	523 (55.8)	523 (55.8)	390 (41.6)	392 (41.8)	756 (80.6)	715 (76.2)
Summary Data (Gr. 1-11)		1731 (10.9)	1094 (9.8)	7056 (62.8)	6774 (60.6)	2949 (26.3)	3304 (29.6)	6786 (61.3)	7199 (65.7)

Of the alternative students tested in reading, 10.9% were in the below average stanines while 20.9% of the non-alternative students scored in this stanine category. A total of 62.8% of the alternative students scored in the average stanines compared to 61.3% of non-alternative students. Stanines 7 through 9 contained 26.3% of the alternative group and 17.8% of the non-alternative students. (See Table 5.)

In mathematics, 9.8% of the alternative students scored in the below average stanines while 19.5% of the non-alternative group scored in this category. The results showed that 60.6% of the alternative group had average stanines compared to 60.1% of the non-alternative students. The above average stanine category included 29.6% of the alternative population and 20.5% of the non-alternative students. (See Table 5.)

It can be seen from the data in Table 5 that there are more alternative students in the above average category in both reading and mathematics, with fewer alternative students in the below average stanine group. The differences between the two groups in the average stanines are slight. It is important to remember that these data do not show achievement progress, but rather they describe existing differences in achievement.

Table 5. Comparison of California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Mathematics, Stanine Distribution for Alternative and Non-Alternative Groups, Grades 1-11, March - April, 1985.

	Below Average Stanines 1-3		Average Stanines 4-6		Above Average Stanines 7-9	
	TR N (%)	TM N (%)	TR N (%)	TM N (%)	TR N (%)	TM N (
Alt.	1231 (10.9)	1094 (9.8)	7056 (62.8)	6774 (60.6)	2949 (26.3)	3304 (29.6
Non-Alt.	5217 (20.9)	4841 (19.5)	15312 (61.3)	14939 (60.1)	4444 (17.8)	5096 (20.5

Achievement Gains, Matched Promoted Students, Normal Curve Equivalents

Table 6 shows achievement gain data in normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for the alternative student population. These data are derived from the results of two years of testing with the California Achievement Tests. Promoted students in alternative programs tested in April, 1984 and again in March - April, 1985 are included in this data. NCE gains are shown for grades 2-11, but not for grade 1.

In reviewing NCE data, it is important to understand that if students maintain their NCE scores from year to year (resulting in a gain of 0), they are meeting the expected achievement level. An increase in average NCEs from one testing date to another would indicate that more than expected achievement growth had occurred. Conversely, losses in average NCEs indicate less than expected achievement as compared to the norm group. In addition, a gain of NCEs represents exactly the same amount of expected performance improvement for pupils at the extreme low end of the achievement distribution as it does for the average and above average achievers.

It can be seen from the data in Table 6 that the average NCE gain was -2.2 in reading and -1.6 in mathematics. These results indicate that students in alternative programs did not improve achievement levels overall in these important basic skills.

Table 6. Normal Curve Equivalent Status and Gains, California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Matched and Promoted Alternative Students by Program and Location, April, 1984 and April, 1985.

Program/Location	Total Reading Avg. NCE 1984	 Avg. NCE 1985	 NCE * Gain	Total Math Avg. NCE 1984	 Avg. NCE 1985	 NCE * Gain
Applied Arts Academy						
Oyler	41.8	43.1	+1.3	38.7	38.6	-0.1
Elementary College Preparatory						
Anderson Place	77.6	77.7	+0.1	86.7	88.0	+1.3
Bond Hill	60.8	60.5	-0.3	57.6	59.5	+1.9
Burton	52.7	53.4	+0.7	60.0	65.9	+5.9
Covedale	65.6	63.1	-2.5	67.9	67.2	-0.7
Pleasant Hill	60.8	60.8	0.0	62.4	67.8	+5.4
Roselawn/Condon	67.2	65.2	-2.0	68.9	66.6	-2.3
Elementary Individually Guided Education						
Eastern Hills	50.7	48.3	-2.4	53.1	50.8	-2.3
Heinold	43.5	42.2	-1.3	47.5	45.9	-1.6
North Avondale	51.9	50.0	-1.9	51.3	52.2	+0.9
Silverton	53.9	52.4	-1.5	53.4	53.9	+0.5
Woodford	66.4	62.1	-4.3	63.9	64.7	+0.8
Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science						
Rockdale	56.1	52.8	-3.3	61.6	56.1	-5.5
Extended Day Enrichment Program						
Heberle	52.7	50.5	-2.2	54.4	50.9	-3.5
French Bilingual						
Carthage	56.4	54.8	-1.6	64.8	58.3	-6.5
Midway	61.0	57.4	-3.6	63.2	62.9	-0.3
Mt. Washington	69.5	63.9	-5.6	72.7	67.0	-5.7
Fundamental Academy						
College Hill	57.3	57.5	+0.2	59.8	58.0	-1.8
Linwood	57.0	56.8	-0.2	59.3	60.5	+1.2
German Bilingual						
Fairview	68.6	67.5	-1.1	69.0	69.0	0.0
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program						
Bramble	60.4	53.9	-6.5	52.2	49.1	-3.1
Pleasant Hill	61.4	53.2	-8.2	64.4	55.4	-9.0
Intermediate University Demonstration School						
Chase	46.9	45.3	-1.6	48.7	46.1	-2.6
Montessori						
North Avondale	57.5	60.6	+3.1	50.9	58.3	+7.4
Sands	62.5	60.7	-1.8	65.3	63.3	-2.0
Multi-Age						
Clifton	58.8	57.2	-1.6	59.9	58.9	-1.0
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center						
Douglass	56.3	52.6	-3.7	55.9	49.9	-6.0
Spanish Bilingual						
Cheviot	----	----	----	----	----	----
Hartwell	67.4	63.2	-4.2	67.3	63.7	-3.6
Mt. Airy	62.0	61.5	-0.5	61.7	58.9	-2.8
Pleasant Ridge	63.2	62.1	-1.1	66.1	61.6	-4.5
Swifton	55.9	55.4	-0.5	54.6	58.4	+3.8
Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics & Science						
Woodward (CAMAS)	53.5	50.6	-2.9	58.0	56.3	-1.7
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education						
CAPE	48.2	45.6	-2.6	48.4	48.7	+0.3
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy						
Schiel	59.6	57.6	-2.0	60.2	59.1	-1.1
City-Wide Learning Community						
Hughes	43.1	37.5	-5.6	42.6	40.4	-2.2
Computers Unlimited						
Hughes	60.3	56.4	-3.9	64.0	55.9	-8.1
International Studies Academy						
Withrow	57.6	53.0	-4.6	57.5	53.7	-3.8
Junior High College Readiness						
Dater	58.1	58.1	0.0	64.0	61.0	-3.0
Peoples	58.9	58.7	-0.2	59.6	57.2	-2.4
Porter	46.9	45.6	-1.3	49.6	45.1	-4.5
Schwab	57.3	53.8	-3.5	55.0	51.3	-3.7
Shroder	59.6	54.7	-4.9	64.3	66.1	+1.8
School for Creative and Performing Arts						
SCPA	64.6	62.6	-2.0	63.6	63.0	-0.6
Summary Data (Gr. 2-11)	56.3	54.1	-2.2	57.6	56.0	-1.6
Number of Matched Promoted Students		9431			9389	

* Gains can be reported only for students in grades 2 through 11.

Table 7 shows the achievement gains in reading and mathematics for alternative and non-alternative students. The alternative group's gains were slightly lower than those in the non-alternative group, a deviation of -0.2 in reading and -0.2 in mathematics. Neither group met the expected achievement growth.

Table 7. Comparison of Mean NCE Gains for Alternative and Non-Alternative Students on the California Achievement Tests, Grades 2-11, April, 1984 and March - April, 1985.

TOTAL READING

Non-Alternative			Alternative		
1984	1985	Gain	1984	1985	Gain
$\bar{X}$ = 51.1	$\bar{X}$ = 49.1	$\bar{X}$ = -2.0	$\bar{X}$ = 56.3	$\bar{X}$ = 54.1	$\bar{X}$ = -2.2
	N = 17,596			N = 9,431	

TOTAL MATHEMATICS

Non-Alternative			Alternative		
1984	1985	Gain	1984	1985	Gain
$\bar{X}$ = 52.6	$\bar{X}$ = 51.2	$\bar{X}$ = -1.4	$\bar{X}$ = 57.6	$\bar{X}$ = 56.0	$\bar{X}$ = -1.6
	N = 17,486			N = 9,389	

Attitudes

During November, 1984, School Information System (SIS) surveys were administered to both the alternative and non-alternative students, parents, and teachers at the elementary, junior, and senior high school levels.

Student Attitudes

Surveys were completed by 6,908 (23%) alternative students and 11,271 (37%) non-alternative students at three levels - elementary (grades 4-6), junior/middle (grades 7-8), and senior high (grades 9-12). Results of the survey are shown as percentages of affirmative responses.

Interracial Understanding. Five items on the survey were designed to measure how students felt about interracial understanding. Table 8 shows the percentages of yes responses for both alternative and non-alternative students. Alternative students were more positive in their responses to all of these items.

Table 8. Student Ratings of Interracial Understanding, November, 1984. (Average of All Students Grades 4-12)

Item	Percentage of Yes Responses		
	Alternative Students	Non-Alternative Students	Difference
I like going to school with students of different races.	79%	70%	9%
Students of different races are treated fairly at my school.	73	67	6
In my school, we have talked about interracial understanding.	52	45	7
Students of different races get along well in my school.	65	57	8
It is important to go to school with students of other races.	67	61	6

Attitude Toward School. Five items on the student survey were used to assess how students felt about school and their teachers. Table 9 shows the data on student attitudes toward school. Results indicate that alternative students gave a higher percentage of yes responses to four of five items in the factor. The difference was greatest on item 12, where 63% of the alternative and 50% of the non-alternative students reported that school helps them feel good about themselves. More non-alternative students felt that most of their school work was interesting than did alternative students.

Table 9. Student Attitudes Toward School, November, 1984.
(Average of All Students Grades 4-12)

Item	Percentage of Yes Responses		
	Alternative Students	Non-Alternative Students	Difference
I like school.	70%	68%	2%
I like my school.	[illegible]	65	10
My teachers care about me.	64	55	9
School helps me feel good about myself.	63	50	13
Most of my schoolwork is interesting.	67	76	-9

Safety and Discipline. Five items were used to measure the attitudes of students toward safety and discipline. Table 10 shows that equal percentages of both alternative and non-alternative students felt that students were well-behaved in class and also that these two groups were similar on responses to the items relating to the fairness of punishments and discipline.

Table 10. Student Attitudes Toward Safety and Discipline, November, 1984. (Average of All Students Grades 4-12)

Item	Percentage of Yes Responses		
	Alternative Students	Non-Alternative Students	Difference
Students at my school are well behaved in class.	42%	42%	0%
There is good discipline in my school.	65	55	10
I feel safe at school.	63	55	8
My parents feel there is good discipline in my school.	62	49	13
Discipline in my school is handled fairly.	58	53	5
Punishments are given fairly at my school.	51	47	4

Parent Attitudes

Surveys were completed by 4,166 (41%) parents of alternative students and by 5,330 (53%) of parents of non-alternative students. The evaluative scale was the percent of responses to "yes," "no," and "undecided." Only the "yes" responses are shown in the presentation of results.

Interracial Understanding. An assessment of how parents felt the schools were doing in the area of interracial understanding is presented in Table 11. The five survey items measuring interracial understanding received an average affirmative response of 75% by parents of alternative students, which was 11% higher than the average of non-alternative parents.

Alternative parents gave a higher percentage of yes responses to the five items used to determine how parents felt about interracial understanding as they see it in the schools. Over 80% of alternative parents felt that their children should have interracial experiences in their school and would keep their children in the Cincinnati Public Schools if all schools were racially balanced. Fifty-six percent of non-alternative parents gave yes responses to the item concerning whether there is good interracial understanding in their child's school.

Table 11. Parent Ratings of Interracial Understanding, November, 1984.

Item	Percentage of Yes Responses		
	Alternative Students	Non-Alternative Students	Difference
Do you believe the staff at your child's school supports interracial understanding?	75%	67%	8%
Would you keep your child in the Cincinnati Public Schools if all schools were racially balanced?	82	73	9
Do you believe children should have interracial experiences in their school program?	83	70	13
Do you think there is good interracial understanding in your child's school?	69	56	13
Has the school done a good job of promoting interracial understanding?	65	54	11

Attitude Toward School. The percentages of yes responses for the five items relating to parent attitude toward school are shown in Table 12. Alternative parents were more positive on all items and had an average response of 80% for all five items. This high rating would seem to indicate that alternative parents felt good about the quality of education their children are receiving. Non-alternative parents also gave a very favorable average response of 73% indicating their satisfaction with the job neighborhood schools are doing educating their children.

Table 12. Parent Attitudes Toward School, November, 1984.

Item	Percentage of Yes Responses Alternative Students	Non-Alternative Students	Difference
Does your child's school teach what you think should be learned?	90%	83%	7%
Are you satisfied with the quality of teaching at your child's school?	85	74	11
Has the school done a good job of teaching your child basic skills such as reading?	85	79	6
Do you believe your child's teachers take a personal interest in him/her?	71	62	9
Do you feel your school's programs are meeting the individual needs of your child?	76	66	10

<ins>Safety and Discipline</ins>. Table 13 shows the parent responses on the five items dealing with safety and discipline. The results show that alternative and non-alternative parents are similar in their response ratings.

Table 13. Parent Attitudes Toward Safety and Discipline, November, 1984.

Item	Percentage of Yes Responses Alternative Students	Non-Alternative Students	Difference
Do you feel there is good discipline in your child's school?	81%	71%	10%
Do you feel your child is safe at school?	84	75	9
Do you think your child is treated fairly at school?	85	81	4
Do you believe the principal in your child's school is doing a good job?	82	77	5
Do you feel your child is receiving an education that will help him/her become a good citizen?	89	81	8

Teacher Attitudes

The School Information System teacher survey was administered to both alternative and non-alternative teachers in November, 1984. A total of 1,117 (53%) non-alternative teacher surveys and 564 (27%) surveys of teachers identifying themselves as alternative teachers at all levels were returned. The responses given by the elementary, junior high, and senior high teachers are shown for comparative purposes. The survey form used a 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent) evaluative scale with a rating of 4 considered average.

Alternative teachers' ratings for all items were only slightly more positive than the non-alternative teachers. Average ratings of the 56 items on the teacher survey were given a 0.25 higher rating by the alternative teachers. Non-alternative teachers had a better than average rating of 4.5 and alternative teachers responded with a higher average rating of 4.7.

Interracial Understanding. The seven items used to assess teacher, interracial understanding are shown in Table 14. The table shows that alternative teachers gave higher ratings on all seven items, but only two of these items show significant differences between alternative and non-alternative teachers (a significant difference being a difference of .50 and above). The alternative teachers gave a mean rating of 4.9 to these items, while non-alternative teachers responded with an average rating of 4.5.

Table 14. Teacher Ratings of Interracial Understanding, November, 1984.

Item	Mean Ratings Alternative Teachers (N=)	Non-Alternative Teachers (N=)	Difference
Degree to which students of all races are treated fairly in our school.	5.59	5.31	.28
Degree of interracial understanding within our school staff.	5.12	4.86	.26
Staff support for improved interracial understanding.	5.01	4.69	.32
Adequacy of my school's efforts to improve interracial understanding.	4.93	4.54	.39
Degree of interracial understanding within our student body.	4.96	4.43	.53
Effectiveness of system's programs to achieve student racial balance.	4.99	4.16	.83
Impact of the desegregation settlement on teachers at my school.	3.97	3.70	.27

Attitude Toward School. The mean ratings of alternative and non-alternative teachers on five items used to assess teacher attitude toward school are shown in Table 15. Alternative and non-alternative teachers were very close in their ratings of these five items with no significant differences occurring on any item. Average responses were 5.2 for alternative teachers and 5.1 for non-alternative teachers. It is of particular interest that the morale of non-alternative teachers as it relates to their school is just as high as that of alternative teachers, and that both groups of teachers felt similarly about administrator's cooperation with the teachers in their school.

Table 15. Teacher Attitudes Toward School, November, 1984.

Item	Mean Ratings Alternative Teachers (N=)	 Non-Alternative Teachers (N=)	 Difference
Satisfaction with my teaching assignment.	5.61	5.49	.12
General quality of teaching in our school.	5.63	5.35	.28
Administrator(s) cooperation with the teachers in our school.	5.08	5.05	.03
My morale as it relates to my school.	5.04	5.00	.04
Staff morale in our school.	4.64	4.50	.14

Safety and Discipline. In the area of safety and discipline, there was little difference in the response of alternative and non-alternative teachers indicating agreement on four of five items. On the fifth item, there was a significant deviation favoring alternative teachers who felt that their students' behavior was better than what non-alternative teachers had indicated for their students. The percent of yes responses for teachers of alternative and non-alternative students are shown in Table 16. Based on the items listed in Table 16, the alternative teachers gave an average rating of 4.9 to this factor, while the non-alternative teachers gave a 4.7 average response.

Table 16. Teacher Attitudes Toward Safety and Discipline, November, 1984.

Item	Mean Ratings		
	Alternative Teachers (N=)	Non-Alternative Teachers (N=)	Difference
Students freedom from physical threat in our school.	5.32	4.92	.40
Administrative help in our school with discipline problems.	4.93	4.82	.11
Clarity of our school's code of discipline.	4.90	4.80	.10
Effectiveness of disciplinary procedures in our school.	4.79	4.59	.20
Behavior of students in our school.	4.64	4.13	.51

Overall, these data indicate that students, parents, and teachers in alternative programs hold slightly more positive attitudes than their non-alternative school counterparts on several key aspects of the educational process.

Program Costs

The excess staff are teachers and instructional assistants who are assigned to alternative programs in addition to regular staffing allocations. Similarly, non-personnel budget allocations are supplements to allocations routinely made to schools. It should be noted, however, that excess teaching staff members are not additional staff beyond the number needed to comply with the pupil-teacher ratio required by Senate Bill 170. Thus, the costs reported for excess staff in alternative programs do not represent additions to the school system budget.

Table 17 shows the number of excess teachers and instructional assistants assigned to alternative programs during the 1984-85 school year. The cost figures shown in the table are based on average salaries for the school year and they include expenditures for benefits as a percentage of the average salaries. The total of 126 excess teachers was 15 teachers higher compared to the previous school year, while there were 5.0 more instructional assistants during the 1984-85 school year.

Table 17. Estimated Personnel Costs of Alternative Programs, 1984-85.

Program	Teachers	Instructional Assistants	Cost*
Applied Arts Academy 1 site	2.0	0.0	$ 51,869.90
Elementary College Preparatory 6 sites	.96	0.0	24,897.55
Elementary Individually Guided Education 5 sites	20.5	30.0	531,666.47 264,682.50
Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science 1 site	.20	1.0	5,186.99 8,822.75
Extended Day Enrichment Program 1 site	2.5	0.0	64,837.38
French Bilingual 3 sites	7.0	0.0	181,544.65
Fundamental Academy 2 sites	3.0	0.0	77,804.85
German Bilingual 1 site	6.0	1.0	155,609.70 8,822.75
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program 2 sites	0.0	0.0	0.0
Intermediate University Demonstration School 1 site	3.9	0.0	101,146.30

(Continued on next page)

Table 17. (Continued)

Program	Teachers	Instructional Assistants	Cost*
Montessori	13.5		$ 350,121.82
2 sites		47.0	414,669.25
Multi-Age	2.0		51,869.90
1 site		8.0	70,582.00
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center	3.9		101,146.30
1 site		4.0	35,291.00
Spanish Bilingual	12.0		311,219.40
5 sites		0.0	
Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics and Science	6.0		155,609.70
1 site		2.0	17,645.50
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education	9.0		233,414.55
1 site		0.0	
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy (Schiel)	4.5		116,707.27
1 site		0.0	
City-Wide Learning Community	1.0		25,934.95
1 site		0.0	
Computers Unlimited	1.0		25,934.95
1 site		0.0	
International Studies Academy	6.0		155,609.70
1 site		0.0	
Junior High College Readiness	12.0		311,219.40
5 sites		0.0	
School for Creative and Performing Arts	9.0		233,414.55
1 site		0.0	
Subtotals			$3,266,766.28
			$ 820,515.75
Total	125.96	93.0	$4,087,282.03

*Cost figures are based on average salaries for the school year and they include expenditures for benefits.

Table 18 shows the non-personnel budget allocations to alternative programs during the 1984-85 school year. These funds were allocated by program managers for special needs related to equipment, supplies, supplementary books and inservice training. Comparative data from the 1983-84 school year are also shown in the table.

Table 18. Comparison of Non-Personnel Budget for Alternative Programs, 1983-84 and 1984-85.

Program	1983-84	1984-85
Applied Arts Academy	$ 1,500	$ 1,560
Bilingual Programs	10,000	36,000
Elementary College Preparatory	10,000	9,000
Elementary Individually Guided Education	20,000	24,240
Elementary Academy of Mathematics and Science	5,000	7,140
Extended Day Enrichment Program	---	21,900
Fundamental Academy	700	1,700
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program	1,270	5,410
Intermediate University Demonstration School	1,000	7,150
Montessori	95,000	49,780
Multi-Age	3,180	7,050
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center	3,000	5,000
Cincinnati Academy of Mathematics and Science	25,000	13,500
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education	30,000	19,410
City-Wide Learning Community	2,000	1,240
Computers Unlimited	---	316,508
International Studies Academy	17,000	17,140
Junior High College Readiness	5,000	7,800
School for Creative and Performing Arts	20,000	11,640
Total Allocated	$249,650	$563,168

Summary

With the addition of two new alternative sites, the enrollment has shown an increase of 566 students for a total of 14,420 students enrolled in alternative programs during the 1984-85 school year. For the 1984-85 school year, 35 of the 44 alternative programs met the racial balance guidelines established by the school system.

California Achievement Test results comparing alternative and non-alternative students reveal fewer alternative students in the below average stanines, and a larger percentage of alternative students in the above average stanines. These test data also show non-alternative students making slightly higher gains than alternative students in both reading and mathematics. Neither group, however, met the expected achievement growth.

Results of the attitude surveys display higher positive responses given by the alternative groups.

Monies allocated for excess teachers and instructional assistants totaled approximately $4,087,282. The non-personnel allocated budget amounted to $563,168.

Approved:
Joseph F. Gastright
Evaluation Branch

APPENDIX B

Evaluation
Branch

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

1983-84

By Maxine Stolar

November, 1984

Cincinnati Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ii

Introduction 1

Program Evaluation

Data Sources. 2
Enrollment and Location 2
Achievement Status. 6
Achievement Gains 10
Attitudes 12
Program Costs 18

Summary. 22

Tables

1. Alternative Program Membership Distribution and Percent of Black Students, December, 1983. 3

2. Comparison of Percentages of Black Membership and Deviation from Guideline Range, December, 1982, and December, 1983. 4

3. Alternative Program Locations by District Area, 1983-84 5

4. CAT Total Reading and Total Math Stanine Distribution and Percent At and Above National Norm for Alternative Programs by Location, April, 1984 7

5. Comparison of California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Stanine Distributions for Alternative and Non-Alternative Groups, Grades 1-11, April, 1984. 9

6. Normal Curve Equivalents Status and Gains, California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Matched and Promoted Alternative Students by Program and Location, April, 1983 and April, 1984 11

7. Comparison of Mean NCE Gains for Matched and Promoted Students, Alternative and Non-Alternative Population, California Achievement Tests, Grades 1-11, April, 1983, and April, 1984 12

8. Estimated Personnel Costs of Alternative Programs, 1983-84. . . . 19

9. Comparison of Non-Personnel Budget for Alternative Programs, 1982-83 and 1983-84 21

Executive Summary

The data in this report indicate that 13,854 students attended alternative programs during the 1983-84 school year. The racial composition of these students was 54% Black, 43% white, and 3% of other races, and the total number of students was 503 higher than the previous year's total. Of the 42 alternative programs, 31 fell within the racial balance guidelines established by the school system.

Results on standardized achievement tests in reading and mathematics show fewer alternative students as compared with non-alternative students in the below average stanines, approximately the same percentage in the average stanines, and a larger percentage of alternative students in the above average stanines. Additional test results indicate that both the alternative and non-alternative students obtained the same achievement growth in mathematics. Alternative students, however, made slightly higher gains in reading.

Attitudinal survey data comparing alternative and non-alternative students, teachers, and parents reveal alternative groups giving higher positive responses to items concerning interracial understanding, attitudes toward school, and safety and discipline.

Estimated costs for excess teachers and instructional assistants during the 1983-84 school year was $4,093,368. The non-personnel budget allocations to alternative programs during the 1983-84 school year was $249,650.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS
1983-84

Introduction

For more than one hundred years the neighborhood school to which children are assigned according to their places of residence has been the dominant vehicle for schooling in the United States. Certainly, there have always been exceptions to this prevailing pattern: private and parochial schools, evening schools, and area vocational schools. For the majority of families, however, assignment to neighborhood public schools has been the norm.

During the last fourteen years, alternative programs have emerged in Cincinnati to provide additional options to attendance in neighborhood schools. As of December, 1983, there were 20 such programs in 40 schools. Two schools hosted two different alternative programs. In 1983, three additions were made to alternative programs - a French bilingual program at Mt. Washington, Spanish bilingual at Cheviot, and Montessori at North Avondale, grades K and 1. Approximately 14,000 students in Cincinnati Public Schools now attend an alternative program. The voluntary nature of the alternatives creates a new structure for public education without forcing families into something they do not want. These programs were designed to provide specialized learning experiences along with the traditional academic curricula.

Since balanced racial composition is the primary goal, applications for entrance into an alternative program are received from students regardless of where they may reside in Cincinnati. Acceptance to the program is based primarily on racial balance, but students must also meet skill or achievement requirements for some programs.

The purpose of this report is to present a compilation of evaluation data related to alternative programs in the Cincinnati Public Schools during the 1983-84 school year. It is designed to assist in the decision-making processes related to these programs. Enrollment data, achievement status, achievement gains, attitudinal survey results and estimated costs will be presented for total alternative programs functioning in the 1983-84 school year.

Program Evaluation

Data Sources

Data for this report have been obtained from various sources. Enrollment and racial composition are reported by the Alternative Programs Office in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. California Achievement Test data are maintained by the Testing Section of the Evaluation Branch. Attitude surveys are administered through the School Information Section of the Evaluation Branch. Cost figures are obtained from the Alternative Programs Office and the Administrative Research Section of the Evaluation Branch.

Enrollment and Location

Enrollment and racial composition data as of December, 1983, are shown in Table 1. The source is enrollment data on file in the Alternative Programs Office at that time. These data indicate that a total of 13,854 students were enrolled in alternative programs. This is an increase of 503 students over enrollment in the 1982-83 school year. The racial composition of the 1983-84 alternative students was 54% Black, 43% white, and 3% of other races. These percentages are very similar to those for the previous two school years.

An effort is made in the enrollment of students for alternative programs to maintain a racial balance reflecting that of the school district. Admission procedures follow the general guidelines of maintaining a 30% to 70% black membership in each program. For the 1983-84 school year, 31 (74%) of the 42 programs fell within these racial balance guidelines. This is a slight

Table 1. Alternative Program Membership Distribution and Percent of Black Students, December, 1983.

Program/Location		Black	White	Other	Total	Percent Black
Applied Arts Academy						
Oyler	(4-6)	29	125	2	156	18.6%
Elementary College Preparatory						
Anderson Place	(4-6)	42	41	3	86	48.8
Bond Hill	(4-6)	70	1	0	71	98.6
Burton	(4-6)	52	1	0	53	98.1
Covedale	(4-6)	83	144	4	231	35.9
Pleasant Hill	(4-6)	82	26	0	108	75.9
Roselawn/Condon	(4-8)	162	148	10	320	50.6
Elementary Individually Guided Education						
Eastern Hills	(K-8)	284	342	5	631	45.0
Heinold	(K-8)	440	237	0	677	65.0
North Avondale	(2-6)	237	7	2	246	96.3
Silverton	(K-6)	145	32	6	183	79.2
Woodford	(K-3)	232	195	6	433	53.6
Elementary Math and Science Academy						
Rockdale	(4-6)	57	2	0	59	96.6
French Bilingual						
Carthage	(K-4)	127	140	2	269	47.2
Midway	(K-5)	116	164	11	291	39.9
Mt. Washington	(K-1)	43	110	0	153	28.1
Fundamental Academy						
College Hill	(K-6)	328	216	3	547	60.0
Linwood	(K-6)	134	199	4	337	39.8
German Bilingual						
Fairview	(K-5)	211	257	28	496	42.5
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program						
Bramble	(K-3)	80	85	7	172	46.5
Pleasant Hill	(K-3)	236	126	7	369	64.0
Intermediate Demonstration Center						
Chase Int.	(4-6)	430	283	2	715	60.1
Montessori						
North Avondale	(K-1)	102	44	8	154	66.2
Sands	(K-6)	329	332	9	670	49.1
Multi-Age, Non-Graded						
Clifton	(K-6)	355	290	58	703	50.5
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center						
Douglass	(K-6)	292	192	19	503	58.1
Spanish Bilingual						
Cheviot	(K)	35	73	1	109	32.1
Hartwell	(K-5)	109	121	4	234	46.6
Mt. Airy	(K-5)	138	119	3	260	53.1
Pleasant Ridge	(K-5)	213	170	16	399	53.4
Swifton	(K-5)	81	29	2	112	72.3
Cincinnati Academy of Math and Science						
Woodward (CAMAS)	(7-12)	333	96	2	431	77.3
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education						
CAPE	(4-12)	621	612	8	1,241	50.0
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy						
Schiel	(6-8)	236	136	23	395	59.7
City-Wide Learning Community						
Hughes	(9-12)	71	52	1	124	57.3
International Studies Academy						
Withrow	(9-12)	206	93	65	364	56.6
Junior High College Readiness						
Dater	(7-9)	17	15	0	32	53.1
Peoples	(7-8)	67	39	3	109	61.5
Porter	(7-9)	45	38	0	83	54.2
Schwab	(7-8)	54	42	1	97	55.7
Shroder	(7-9)	62	5	0	67	92.5
School for Creative and Performing Arts						
SCPA	(4-12)	547	598	19	1,164	47.0
TOTAL		7,533	5,977	344	13,854	54.4%

improvement over the previous school year when 69% of the programs met these guidelines.

Table 2 lists the alternative program locations that did not meet the guidelines of 30% to 70% black membership in 1982-83 or 1983-84. These data show that programs in nine locations did not meet the racial requirement in both 1982-83 and 1983-84.

Table 2. Comparison of Percentages of Black Membership and Deviation from Guideline Range, December, 1982, and December, 1983.

Program/Location	December 1982		December 1983	
	% Black	% Deviation	% Black	% Deviation
Applied Arts Academy				
Oyler	12.3%	17.7%	18.6%	11.4%
Elementary College Preparatory				
Bond Hill	93.8	23.8	98.6	28.6
Burton	97.9	27.9	98.1	28.1
Pleasant Hill	70.5	NONE	75.9	5.9
Elementary Individually Guided Education				
Heinold	86.6	16.6	65.0	NONE
North Avondale	96.1	26.1	96.3	26.3
Silverton	87.5	17.5	79.2	9.2
Elementary Math and Science Academy				
Rockdale	97.4	27.4	96.6	26.6
French Bilingual				
Mt. Washington	NO PROGRAM		28.1	1.9
Spanish Bilingual				
Swifton	71.6	1.6	72.3	2.3
Cincinnati Academy of Math and Science				
Woodward (CAMAS)	75.9	5.9	77.3	7.3
Junior High College Readiness				
Peoples	81.4	11.4	61.5	NONE
Shroder	93.3	23.3	92.5	22.5

Table 3 presents a summary of program locations by area of the city. The data show that there are five single-location programs being operated in the eastern area of the city and seven in the west. Programs with multiple locations are well distributed throughout the district.

Table 3. Alternative Program Locations by District Area, 1983-84.

Program Title	Number of Program Locations by Area		
	East	West	Total
*Applied Arts Academy	0	1	1
Elementary College Preparatory	4	2	6
Elementary Individually Guided Education	4	1	5
*Elementary Math and Science Academy	1	0	1
French Bilingual	1	2	3
Fundamental Academy	1	1	2
*German Bilingual	1	0	1
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program	1	1	2
*Intermediate Demonstration Center	0	1	1
Montessori	1	1	2
*Multi-Age, Non-Graded	0	1	1
*Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center	1	0	1
Spanish Bilingual	3	2	5
*Cincinnati Academy of Math and Science	1	0	1
*Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education	0	1	1
*Cincinnati Bilingual Academy (Schiel)	0	1	1
*City-Wide Learning Community	0	1	1
*International Studies Academy	1	0	1
Junior High College Readiness	2	3	5
*School for Creative and Performing Arts	0	1	1
TOTALS	22	20	42

*Program located at one site only.

Achievement Status

California Achievement Tests were administered in April, 1984, to all students in grades 1 through 11, including students in alternative programs. Computerized analyses of the test data made it possible to determine results separately for alternative program students and non-alternative students. Tables 4-7 present summaries of the data.

Table 4 shows the numbers and percentages of alternative program students whose scores attained or exceeded the "national norm" and those whose scores fall into three stanine categories - below average (stanines 1, 2, and 3), average (stanines 4, 5, and 6), and above average (stanines 7, 8, and 9). The data presented are based on total reading and total mathematics scores.

Table 4. CAT Total Reading and Total Math Stanine Distribution and Percent At and Above National Norm for Alternative Programs by Location, April, 1984.

Program/Location		Stanine Category						At and Above National Norm Total Program N (%)	
		Below Average (1-3) N (%)		Average (4-6) N (%)		Above Average (7-9) N (%)			
		TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM
Applied Arts Academy									
Oyler	(4-6)	53 (50.5%)	54 (51.9%)	47 (44.8%)	47 (45.2%)	5 (4.8%)	3 (2.9%)	24 (22.9%)	12 (11.5%)
Intermediate Demonstration Center									
Chase Int.	(4-6)	165 (26.0)	135 (21.3)	418 (65.9)	429 (67.7)	51 (8.0)	70 (11.0)	225 (35.5)	270 (42.6)
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center									
Douglass	(1-6)	21 (8.2)	31 (12.3)	147 (57.4)	145 (57.5)	88 (34.4)	76 (30.2)	168 (65.6)	161 (63.9)
Elementary College Preparatory									
Anderson Place	(4-6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	11 (11.3)	9 (9.4)	86 (88.7)	87 (90.6)	97 (100.0)	96 (100.0)
Bond Hill	(4-6)	0 (0.0)	5 (8.3)	45 (75.0)	33 (55.0)	15 (25.0)	22 (36.7)	53 (88.3)	45 (75.0)
Burton	(4-6)	1 (2.5)	1 (2.5)	34 (85.0)	24 (60.0)	5 (12.5)	15 (37.5)	23 (57.5)	37 (92.5)
Covedale	(4-6)	6 (2.7)	3 (1.3)	122 (54.0)	101 (44.7)	98 (43.4)	122 (54.0)	187 (82.7)	200 (88.5)
Pleasant Hill	(4-6)	8 (7.2)	6 (5.4)	73 (65.8)	77 (69.4)	30 (27.0)	28 (25.2)	86 (77.3)	75 (68.0)
Roselawn/Condon	(4-8)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	109 (43.3)	98 (38.9)	143 (56.7)	154 (61.1)	238 (94.4)	240 (95.2)
Elementary Individually Guided Education									
Eastern Hills	(1-8)	60 (15.7)	46 (11.4)	274 (71.7)	272 (67.5)	48 (12.6)	85 (21.1)	185 (48.4)	230 (57.1)
Heinold	(1-8)	138 (29.5)	117 (25.1)	297 (63.5)	316 (67.7)	33 (7.1)	34 (7.3)	125 (26.7)	179 (38.3)
North Avondale	(2-6)	39 (17.7)	31 (14.0)	137 (62.3)	146 (65.8)	44 (20.0)	45 (20.3)	109 (49.5)	124 (56.4)
Silverton	(1-6)	36 (12.4)	37 (12.7)	206 (70.8)	178 (61.2)	49 (16.8)	76 (26.1)	156 (53.6)	176 (60.5)
Woodford	(1-3)	18 (7.6)	26 (11.0)	110 (46.6)	109 (46.2)	108 (45.8)	101 (42.8)	162 (68.6)	167 (70.8)
Elementary Math and Science Academy									
Rockdale	(4-6)	6 (12.2)	6 (12.2)	38 (77.6)	24 (49.0)	5 (10.2)	19 (38.8)	25 (51.0)	36 (73.5)
French Bilingual									
Carthage	(1-4)	19 (14.7)	15 (11.5)	76 (58.9)	57 (43.8)	34 (26.4)	58 (44.6)	74 (57.4)	99 (76.2)
Midway	(1-5)	20 (14.0)	12 (8.3)	69 (48.3)	81 (56.3)	54 (37.8)	51 (35.4)	96 (67.1)	112 (77.8)
Mt. Washington	(1)	1 (1.8)	3 (5.3)	14 (24.6)	14 (24.6)	42 (73.7)	40 (70.2)	51 (89.5)	54 (94.7)
Fundamental Academy									
College Hill	(1-6)	32 (8.5)	25 (6.6)	242 (64.2)	237 (63.0)	103 (27.3)	114 (30.3)	231 (61.3)	264 (70.2)
Linwood	(1-6)	16 (6.9)	16 (6.5)	159 (68.2)	157 (63.6)	58 (24.9)	74 (30.0)	136 (58.4)	168 (68.0)
German Bilingual									
Fairview	(1-5)	9 (3.0)	12 (3.9)	151 (49.7)	144 (47.4)	144 (47.4)	148 (48.7)	259 (85.2)	258 (84.9)
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program									
Bramble	(1-3)	4 (4.7)	16 (19.0)	53 (62.4)	53 (63.1)	28 (32.9)	15 (17.9)	58 (68.2)	44 (52.4)
Pleasant Hill	(1-3)	28 (13.8)	17 (8.3)	108 (53.2)	104 (51.0)	67 (33.0)	83 (40.7)	132 (65.1)	142 (69.9)
Montessori									
North Avondale	(1)	12 (19.0)	19 (30.6)	30 (47.6)	33 (53.2)	21 (33.3)	10 (16.1)	42 (66.1)	30 (48.4)
Sands	(1-6)	35 (7.0)	34 (6.7)	261 (52.0)	228 (44.9)	206 (41.0)	246 (48.4)	362 (72.1)	401 (78.9)
Multi-Age, Non-Graded									
Clifton	(1-6)	85 (16.2)	80 (15.2)	252 (47.9)	264 (50.0)	189 (35.9)	184 (34.8)	313 (59.5)	338 (64.0)

Table 4. (Cont'd.)

Program/Location		Stanine Category						At and Above National Norm Total Program N (%)	
		Below Average (1-3) N (%)		Average (4-6) N (%)		Above Average (7-9) N (%)			
		TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM
Spanish Bilingual									
Hartwell	(1-5)	3 (2.3%)	2 (1.5%)	63 (47.4%)	69 (52.3%)	67 (50.4%)	61 (46.2%)	105 (78.9%)	113 (85.6%)
Mt. Airy	(1-5)	5 (3.3)	7 (4.6)	85 (56.7)	89 (58.9)	60 (40.0)	55 (36.4)	106 (70.7)	111 (73.5)
Pleasant Ridge	(1-5)	17 (9.3)	19 (10.6)	104 (57.1)	79 (44.1)	61 (33.5)	81 (45.3)	127 (69.8)	135 (75.4)
Swifton	(1-5)	6 (9.5)	10 (15.9)	47 (74.6)	41 (65.1)	10 (15.9)	12 (19.0)	33 (52.4)	40 (63.5)
Cincinnati Academy of Math and Science									
Woodward (CAMAS)	(7-11)	29 (10.4)	15 (5.4)	221 (79.2)	207 (74.5)	29 (10.4)	56 (20.1)	154 (55.2)	187 (67.3)
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education									
CAPE	(4-11)	169 (18.6)	147 (16.0)	652 (71.7)	705 (76.9)	88 (9.7)	65 (7.1)	368 (40.5)	415 (45.3)
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy									
Schiel	(6-8)	18 (5.7)	4 (1.3)	206 (65.4)	203 (65.7)	91 (28.9)	102 (33.0)	232 (73.7)	248 (80.3)
Junior High College Readiness									
Dater	(7-9)	1 (3.6)	2 (7.1)	18 (64.3)	14 (50.0)	9 (32.1)	12 (42.9)	22 (78.6)	23 (82.1)
Peoples	(7-8)	3 (3.3)	3 (3.2)	69 (75.8)	70 (75.3)	19 (20.9)	20 (21.5)	71 (78.0)	68 (73.1)
Porter	(7-9)	5 (6.8)	7 (9.5)	64 (87.7)	64 (86.5)	4 (5.5)	3 (4.1)	36 (49.3)	32 (43.2)
Schwab	(7-8)	2 (2.3)	5 (5.7)	67 (77.9)	68 (77.3)	17 (19.8)	15 (17.0)	59 (68.6)	55 (62.5)
Shroder	(7-9)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	50 (84.7)	41 (69.5)	8 (13.6)	18 (30.5)	43 (72.9)	55 (93.2)
School for Creative and Performing Arts									
SCPA	(4-11)	31 (3.3)	34 (3.6)	515 (54.4)	519 (55.0)	400 (42.3)	391 (41.4)	743 (78.5)	702 (74.4)
International Studies Academy									
Withrow	(9-11)	13 (5.2)	22 (9.3)	182 (73.4)	172 (72.6)	53 (21.4)	43 (18.1)	154 (62.1)	142 (59.9)
City-Wide Learning Community									
Hughes	(9-11)	13 (26.0)	14 (28.0)	27 (54.0)	34 (68.0)	10 (20.0)	2 (4.0)	21 (42.0)	20 (40.0)
Summary Data (Gr. 1-11)		1142 (11.7)	1048 (10.7)	5916 (60.4)	5812 (59.2)	2734 (27.9)	2951 (30.1)	5974 (61.0)	6391 (65.1)

Table 5 compares achievement status levels of alternative program students and non-alternative students. Numbers and percentages of students whose scores fall into the below average, average, and above average categories are reported for grades 1 through 11 in total reading and total mathematics.

Of the alternative students tested in reading, 11.7% were in the below average stanines while 20.3% of the non-alternative students scored in this stanine category. A total of 60.4% of the alternative students scored in the average stanines compared to 60.3% of non-alternative students. Stanines 7 through 9 contained 27.9% of the alternative group and 19.3% of the non-alternative students.

In mathematics, 10.7% of the alternative students scored in the below average stanines while 20.2% of the non-alternative group scored in this category. Average stanines showed 59.2% of the alternative group compared to 58.1% of the non-alternative students. The above average stanine category included 30.1% of the alternative population while 21.7% of the non-alternative students scored in stanines 7, 8, and 9.

It can be seen from the data in Table 5 that the alternative students are achieving at a higher status with fewer students in the lower stanines and more in the above average category in both reading and mathematics. The differences between the two groups in the average stanines are slight. It is important to remember that these data should not be construed as an achievement progress report, but rather as a study of the present status of achievement.

Table 5. Comparison of California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Stanine Distributions for Alternative and Non-Alternative Groups, Grades 1-11, April, 1984.

	Below Average Stanines 1-3				Average Stanines 4-6				Above Average Stanines 7-9			
	TR		TM		TR		TM		TR		TM	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Alt.	1142	(11.7)	1048	(10.7)	5916	(60.4)	5812	(59.2)	2734	(27.9)	2951	(30.1)
Non-Alt.	5385	(20.3)	5297	(20.2)	15965	(60.3)	15256	(58.1)	5115	(19.3)	5701	(21.7)

Achievement Gains, Matched Promoted Students, Normal Curve Equivalents

Table 6 presents achievement gain data in normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for the alternative student population. These data are derived from the results of two years of testing with the California Achievement Tests. Promoted students in alternative programs tested in April, 1983, and again in April, 1984, are included in this study. NCE gains are shown for grades 2-11 but not for grade 1.

In reviewing NCE data, it is important to understand that if students maintain their NCE scores from year to year (resulting in a gain of 0) they are meeting the expected achievement level. An increase in average NCEs from one testing date to another would indicate that more than expected achievement growth had occurred. Conversely, losses in average NCEs indicate less than expected achievement as compared to the norm group. In addition, a gain of NCEs represents exactly the same amount of expected performance improvement for pupils at the extreme low end of the achievement distribution as it does for the average and above average achievers. NCEs are sensitive to small gains making the data more precise in reflecting achievement gains or losses.

It can be seen from the data in Table 6 that the average NCE gain was 0.9 in reading and 0.9 in mathematics. These results indicate that students in alternative programs did improve achievement levels overall in these important basic skills.

Table 6. Normal Curve Equivalents Status and Gains, California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Matched and Promoted Alternative Students by Program and Location, April, 1983 and April, 1984.

Program/Location	Total Reading			Total Math		
	Avg. NCE 1983	Avg. NCE 1984	NCE Gain*	Avg. NCE 1983	Avg. NCE 1984	NCE Gain*
Applied Arts Academy						
Oyler	40.2	36.5	-3.6	35.7	34.3	-1.5
Intermediate Demonstration Center						
Chase Int.	45.0	44.8	-0.2	46.4	47.0	+0.6
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center						
Douglass	61.6	57.6	-4.0	57.2	54.4	-2.8
Elementary College Preparatory						
Anderson Place	74.5	79.7	+5.2	79.6	85.5	+5.8
Bond Hill	57.5	59.3	+1.8	58.5	58.0	-0.5
Burton	50.5	52.2	+1.7	56.9	61.7	+4.8
Covedale	63.2	62.7	-0.5	63.6	67.7	+4.1
Pleasant Hill	55.8	57.7	+1.9	58.1	55.0	-3.1
Roselawn/Condon	64.9	68.5	+3.6	66.2	69.2	+3.0
Elementary Individually Guided Education						
Eastern Hills	47.8	49.1	+1.4	51.6	52.8	+1.2
Heinold	39.0	40.9	+1.8	42.4	45.1	+2.7
North Avondale	50.6	50.4	-0.2	51.4	51.6	+0.2
Silverton	50.1	51.3	+1.2	48.8	54.5	+5.7
Woodford	62.7	62.0	-0.8	56.2	58.3	+2.2
Elementary Math and Science Academy						
Rockdale	50.7	50.5	-0.2	53.5	59.5	+6.0
French Bilingual						
Carthage	49.0	47.6	-1.4	47.7	53.8	+6.2
Midway	55.9	55.0	-0.9	59.6	59.1	-0.5
Mt. Washington	----	70.7	----	----	74.0	----
Fundamental Academy						
College Hill	54.3	55.2	+0.9	53.0	57.3	+4.3
Linwood	54.6	55.5	+0.9	60.5	59.7	-0.8
German Bilingual						
Fairview	65.9	67.8	+1.9	65.7	68.8	+3.1
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program						
Bramble	55.1	54.4	-0.7	52.1	47.2	-4.9
Pleasant Hill	52.4	52.6	+0.2	57.1	59.1	+2.0
Montessori						
North Avondale	----	54.9	----	----	47.1	----
Sands	58.7	59.5	+0.8	58.4	63.7	+5.2
Multi-Age, Non-Graded						
Clifton	55.3	57.8	+2.5	56.7	57.4	+0.6
Spanish Bilingual						
Hartwell	65.8	65.5	-0.3	68.0	63.2	-4.8
Mt. Airy	54.5	61.3	+6.7	53.4	59.5	+6.1
Pleasant Ridge	58.7	61.4	+2.8	61.8	63.2	+1.4
Swifton	50.6	54.7	+4.2	50.5	52.3	+1.8
Cincinnati Academy of Math and Science						
Woodward (CAMAS)	47.5	50.0	+2.5	58.7	55.2	-3.6
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education						
CAPE	47.0	47.0	+0.1	49.8	47.5	-2.3
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy						
Schiel	57.2	58.7	+1.5	57.7	61.2	+3.5
Junior High College Readiness						
Dater	61.3	57.5	-3.7	58.9	59.9	+1.0
Peoples	56.7	57.5	+0.8	57.6	56.1	-1.5
Porter	47.4	48.6	+1.2	53.4	48.9	-4.5
Schwab	54.6	55.5	+0.9	53.3	53.1	-0.2
Shroder	51.8	54.1	+2.3	59.3	61.9	+2.6
School for Creative and Performing Arts						
SCPA	61.7	62.4	+0.8	61.6	62.0	+0.5
International Studies Academy						
Withrow	54.2	55.2	+1.0	53.7	54.0	+0.3
City-Wide Learning Community						
Hughes	42.7	45.7	+3.0	46.4	42.9	-3.5
Summary Data (Gr. 2-11)	54.0	54.9	+0.9	55.4	56.3	+0.9
Number of Matched Promoted Students		7764			7791	

* Gains can be reported only for students in grades 2 through 11.

Table 7 compares the mean NCE gains for total reading and total math. The alternative group average NCEs gain was slightly higher than the non-alternative group, a deviation of +0.4 NCEs. The alternative group is recorded as showing similar gains in mathematics. Both groups are meeting and exceeding expected achievement growth.

Table 7. Comparison of Mean NCE Gains for Matched and Promoted Students, Alternative and Non-Alternative Population, California Achievement Tests, Grades 1-11, April, 1983, and April, 1984.

TOTAL READING

Non-Alternative			Alternative		
1983	1984	Gain	1983	1984	Gain
$\bar{X} = 49.4$	$\bar{X} = 49.9$	$\bar{X} = +0.5$	$\bar{X} = 54.0$	$\bar{X} = 54.9$	$\bar{X} = +0.9$
	N = 26,278			N = 7,764	

TOTAL MATHEMATICS

Non-Alternative			Alternative		
1983	1984	Gain	1983	1984	Gain
$\bar{X} = 50.5$	$\bar{X} = 51.4$	$\bar{X} = +0.9$	$\bar{X} = 55.4$	$\bar{X} = 56.3$	$\bar{X} = +0.9$
	N = 26,088			N = 7,791	

Attitudes

During November and December, 1983, School Information System (SIS) surveys were administered to both the alternative and non-alternative students, parents, and teachers at the elementary, junior, and senior high school levels. The alternative and non-alternative responses to these surveys are shown for comparative purposes.

Student Survey. Surveys were administered to 2,136 alternative students and 4,712 non-alternative students at three levels - elementary, junior high, and senior high. Results of the survey are shown as percentages of affirmative responses.

Overall, more positive responses to the 63 item survey are recorded by the alternative students.

The interracial understanding factor, as shown by the following items, was rated more positively by the alternative students.

	Item	Alternative %	Non-Alternative %	Deviation Favoring Alternative Student
4.	I like going to school with students of different races.	81	71	10%
13.	Students of different races are treated fairly at my school.	76	67	9%
20.	In my school we have studied about interracial understanding.	56	45	11%
32.	Students of different races get along well in my school.	65	57	8%
43.	It is important to go to school with students of other races.	71	59	12%

Attitudes toward school were also rated slightly higher by the alternative students.

	Item	Alternative %	Non-Alternative %	Deviation Favoring Alternative Student
2.	I like school.	72	69	3%
5.	I like my school.	73	65	8%
11.	My teachers care about me.	63	52	11%
12.	School helps me feel good about myself.	63	59	4%
21.	Most of my schoolwork is interesting.	72	75	-3%

Attitudes regarding discipline and safety were rated higher by the alternative students.

	Item	Alternative %	Non-Alternative %	Deviation Favoring Alternative Student
19.	Students at my school are well behaved in class.	25	20	5%
22.	There is good discipline in my school.	61	49	12%
29.	I feel safe at school.	61	53	8%
44.	My parents feel there is good discipline in my school.	60	46	14%
57.	Discipline in my school is handled fairly.	60	50	10%
60.	Punishments are given fairly at my school.	50	46	4%

Although the alternative students rated these factors more positive than the non-alternative students, it is apparent that all of these items should record a higher percentage of affirmative responses.

Parent Survey. The School Information System parent survey was administered in December, 1983, to a 50% random sample of parents with children in alternative and non-alternative programs in grades K-12. A total of 5,558 non-alternative parent surveys and 3,200 alternative parent surveys were returned. Results of the survey are shown for comparative results.

Both alternative and non-alternative parents gave high positive responses to many of the survey items. More than 70% of the alternative parents gave affirmative responses to 21 of the 33 items, and 70% or more of the non-alternative parents gave affirmative responses to 16 of these items.

Interracial understanding was rated very positively by the alternative parents. The three survey items related to interracial understanding received an average affirmative response of 76%. This was 11% higher than the average response by non-alternative parents. Both alternative and non-alternative junior high parents rated this factor more positively than the other school levels.

Item	Alternative %	Non-Alternative %	Deviation Favoring Alternative Parents
11. Would you keep your child in the Cincinnati Public Schools if all schools were racially balanced?	83	74	9%
17. Do you believe children should have interracial experiences in their school program?	79	67	12%
23. Do you think there is good student interracial understanding in your child's school?	65	54	11%

Alternative parents also rated the safety/discipline factor higher than the non-alternative parents. The average affirmative response was 84% for alternative parents compared to 76% for non-alternative parents.

Item	Alternative %	Non-Alternative %	Deviation Favoring Alternative Parents
5. Do you feel your child is receiving an education that will help him/her become a good citizen?	88	80	8%
6. Do you think your child is treated fairly at school?	84	80	4%
9. Do you feel your child is safe at school?	84	75	9%
10. Do you believe the principal in your child's school is doing a good job?	81	77	4%
14. Do you feel there is good discipline at your child's school?	82	70	12%

An average value of 86% affirmative response was received from the alternative parents on their attitude toward school. Non-alternative parents rated this factor with an average value of 70.4%.

Item	Alternative %	Non-Alternative %	Deviation Favoring Alternative Parents
3. Does your child's school teach what you think should be learned?	90	83	7%
7. Has the school done a good job of teaching your child basic skills such as reading?	84	78	6%
12. Are you satisfied with the quality of teaching at your child's school?	83	73	10%
19. Do you feel your school's programs are meeting the individual needs of your child?	86	61	25%
20. Do you believe your child's teachers take a personal interest in him/her?	88	57	31%

Teacher Survey. The School Information System teacher survey was administered to both alternative and non-alternative teachers in November, 1983. A total of 1,212 non-alternative teacher surveys and 586 alternative teacher surveys at all levels were returned. The responses given by the elementary, junior high, and senior high teachers are shown for comparative purposes. The survey form used a 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent) evaluative scale with a rating of 4 considered average.

Alternative teachers' ratings were more positive than the non-alternative teachers. Average ratings of the 56 items on the teacher survey were given a 0.5 higher rating by the alternative teachers. Non-alternative teachers had a better than average rating of 4.3 and alternative teachers responded with a higher average rating of 4.8.

Attitudes toward school were rated more positively by the alternative teachers. Average responses were 5.4 for alternative teachers and 5.0 for non-alternative teachers.

	Item	Alternative Mean	Non-Alternative Mean	Deviation Favoring Alternative Teacher
1.	Satisfaction with my teaching assignment.	5.7	5.4	.3
2.	General quality of teaching in our school.	5.8	5.3	.5
6.	My morale as it relates to my school.	5.3	4.9	.4
8.	Teacher-administrator cooperation in our school.	5.2	4.8	.4
22.	Staff morale in our school.	4.9	4.4	.5

The safety/discipline factor was also given a higher rating by the alternative teachers. Based on the items listed below, the alternative teachers gave an average rating of 5.1 to this factor, while the non-alternative teachers gave a 4.6 average response.

	Item	Alternative Mean	Non-Alternative Mean	Deviation Favoring Alternative Teacher
7.	Students' freedom from physical threat in our school.	5.4	4.8	.6
9.	Administrative help in our school with discipline problems.	5.2	4.8	.4
13.	Clarity of our school's code of discipline.	5.0	4.7	.3
21.	Effectiveness of disciplinary procedures in our school.	4.9	4.5	.4
32.	Behavior of students in our school.	4.8	4.2	.6

Alternative teachers were also more positive in rating items related to interracial understanding. The alternative teachers gave a mean rating of 5.2 to the factor, while non-alternative teachers responded with an average rating of 4.6. The interracial understanding items and ratings are listed below.

Item	Alternative Mean	Non-Alternative Mean	Deviation Favoring Alternative Teacher
3. Degree to which students of all races are treated fairly in our school.	5.6	5.1	.5
12. Degree of interracial understanding within our school staff.	5.1	4.7	.4
18. Staff support for improved interracial understanding.	5.1	4.5	.6
20. Adequacy of my school's efforts to improve interracial understanding.	5.0	4.5	.5
23. Degree of interracial understanding within our student body.	5.0	4.4	.6

In general, these data indicate that students, parents, and teachers in alternative programs hold slightly more positive attitudes than their non-alternative school counterparts on several key aspects of the educational process.

Program Costs

Although the complete cost of operating alternative programs cannot be determined easily, alternative program costs related to excess staff and non-personnel budget allocations are identified and reported. The excess staff are teachers and instructional assistants who are assigned to alternative programs in addition to regular staffing allocations. Similarly, non-personnel budget allocations are supplements to allocations routinely made to schools. It should be noted, however, that excess teaching staff members are not additional staff beyond the number needed to comply with the pupil-teacher ratio required by Senate Bill 170. Thus, the costs reported for excess staff in alternative programs do not represent additions to the school system budget.

Table 8 shows the number of excess teachers and instructional assistants assigned to alternative programs during the 1983-84 school year. The cost figures shown in the table are based on average salaries for the school year and they include expenditures for benefits as a percentage of the average salaries. The total of 111 excess teachers was 3.5 teachers higher compared to the previous school year while there were 7.0 more instructional assistants during the 1983-84 school year.

Table 8. Estimated Personnel Costs of Alternative Programs, 1983-84.

Program	Teachers	Instructional Assistants	Cost *
Applied Arts Academy 1 site	2.0	0.0	$ 60,038
Elementary College Preparatory 6 sites	1.0	0.0	30,018
Elementary Individually Guided Education 5 sites	18.5	30.0	555,351 259,523
Elementary Math and Science Academy 1 site	0.0	1.0	0 8,651
French Bilingual 3 sites	5.5	0.0	165,104
Fundamental Academy 2 sites	2.5	0.0	75,047
German Bilingual 1 site	5.5	1.0	165,104 8,651
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program 2 sites	0.0	0.0	0

(Continued on next page)

Table 8. (Cont'd.)

Program	Teachers	Instructional Assistants	Cost *
Intermediate Demonstration Center 1 site	1.0	0.0	$ 30,019
Montessori 2 sites	10.5	42.0	315,199 363,330
Multi-Age, Non-Graded 1 site	2.0	8.0	60,038 69,206
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center 1 site	3.5	4.0	105,066 34,603
Spanish Bilingual 5 sites	12.0	0.0	360,227
Cincinnati Academy of Math and Science 1 site	6.0	2.0	180,114 17,302
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education 1 site	9.0	0.0	270,171
Cincinnati Bilingual Academy (Schiel) 1 site	4.5	0.0	135,085
City-Wide Learning Community 1 site	1.0	0.0	30,019
International Studies Academy 1 site	6.5	0.0	195,123
Junior High College Readiness 5 sites	11.0	0.0	330,208
School for Creative and Performing Arts 1 site	9.0	0.0	270,171
Subtotals			$3,332,102 $ 761,266
Total	111.0	88.0	$4,093,368

* Cost figures are based on average salaries for the school year and they include expenditures for benefits.

Table 9 shows the non-personnel budget allocations to alternative programs during the 1983-84 school year. These funds were allocated by program managers for special needs related to equipment, supplies, supplementary books and in-service training. Comparative data from the 1982-83 school year are also shown in the table.

Table 9. Comparison of Non-Personnel Budget for Alternative Programs, 1982-83 and 1983-84.

Program	1982-83	1983-84
Applied Arts Academy	$ 5,500	$ 1,500
Bilingual	11,525	10,000
Elementary College Preparatory	8,800	10,000
Elementary Math and Science Academy	3,500	5,000
Fundamental Academy	500	700
Individually Guided Education	23,560	20,000
Individual Progress and Social Impact Program	1,725	1,270
Intermediate Demonstration Center	0	1,000
Montessori	15,400	95,000
Multi-Age, Non-Graded	4,500	3,180
Reading/Language Arts Demonstration Center	10,500	3,000
Cincinnati Academy of Math and Science	33,950	25,000
Cincinnati Academy of Physical Education	35,030	30,000
City-Wide Learning Community	7,300	2,000
International Studies Academy	35,860	17,000
Junior High College Readiness	3,001	5,000
School for Creative and Performing Arts	24,000	20,000
Total Allocated	$224,651	$249,650
Total Unallocated	$ 349	$ 350

Summary

With the addition of two new alternative program sites, the enrollment has shown an increase of 503 students for a total of 13,854 students enrolled in alternative programs during the 1983-84 school year. For the 1983-84 school year, 31 of the 42 alternative programs met the racial balance guidelines established by the school system.

California Achievement Test results comparing alternative and non-alternative students reveal fewer alternative students in the below average stanines, approximately the same percentage of both groups achieving at the average stanines, and a larger percentage of alternative students in the above average stanines. These test data also show similar gains between groups in mathematics and a slightly higher gain for the alternative group in reading.

Results of the attitude surveys display higher positive responses given by the alternative groups.

Monies allocated for excess teachers and instructional assistants totaled approximately $4,093,368. The non-personnel allocated budget amounted to $249,650.

Approved:
Albert H. Rouse, Jr.
Evaluation Branch

APPENDIX B

A DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO INFORM PARENTS AND STUDENTS OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative Information Specialists working out of Alternative Information Centers at Douglass and Millvale Elementary Schools used a variety of methods to inform parents and students about alternatives. Listed below are the methods used:

1 - Student Presentations. Specialists made special presentations to students in priority and neighborhood schools with and without alternative programs. During these presentations, a talk was given, slides shown and alternative brochures and applications were made available to interested students.

2 - Alternative Flyers. At each neighboorhood school, specialists provided enough flyers for distribution to each child in the school to take home to parents.

3 - Phone Calls. Specialists talked with a large number of parents who needed information about alternatives or who had students rejected from alternative programs. Specialists gave the parents information on other alternative options available to them.

4 - Parent Meetings/Conferences. Specialists made presentations to preschool parent groups in priority areas as well as in non-priority areas. Specialists attended P.T.A., L.S.A.C., and Chapter One meetings. Specialists scheduled a time for parent conferences at all schools to give parents the opportunity to ask questions or to get help with completing applications.

5 - Community Meetings. Specialists were available to talk at the request of any community group. They spoke to Appalachian groups in the Price Hill area, and the Mt. Washington Civic Association. They attended the Hyde Park Alternative Fair and a variety of programs in local schools.

Mary Gladden
1/6/86

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM INFORMATION CENTER
JULY 1, 1985 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1986

PERSONNEL

Position	Number	Starting Date	Total
Coordinators	4	December 1, 1985	$42,500.00
		Sub-Total	$42,500.00

OTHER COSTS

Mileage	1,200.00
Equipment	500.00
Office Supplies and Printing	2,500.00
Telephone	1,200.00
Sub-Total	$ 5,400.00
GRAND TOTAL	$47,900.00

Mary Gladden
1/6/86

APPENDIX B

Flow Chart for Developing Alternative Programs

Event | Termination Dates

1. Any individual or group may submit in prospectus form to the Communications Branch ideas for alternative programs and other methods of reducing racial isolation.

   Ongoing

2. The Communications Branch sorts and forwards the submitted ideas to the appropriate groups:

Designated Group	Ideas
Alternative Schools Committee	new alternative program prospectuses
Cabinet	extension of existing program prospectuses
Superintendent and Assigned Staff (Committee J)	other means of reducing racial isolation

   Ongoing

3. The designated groups:

   a) screen the prospectuses and either

      - recommend the idea for program development;
      - postpone the idea for future consideration;
      - reject the idea with recommendations for modification; or
      - reject the idea with no future consideration; and

   b) correspond in writing with the author(s) of each prospectus indicating the screening decision.

   2nd Week of February

4. The Evaluation Branch or an external agent selected by it may survey as needed parents, LSACs, and community councils to determine the attractiveness of all of the proposed ideas.

   4th Week of April

5. Assigned staff members develop full program applications from the recommended program ideas, with consideration given to the results of survey indicated in #4.

   4th Week of May

6. The designated groups:

   a) screen the developed program applications;
   b) make modifications, if necessary;
   c) present the full program applications to the Cabinet, with site requirements, for review and reaction.

4th Week of June

7. The Superintendent [or his designee(s)] shares with the Board developed program applications with site requirements.

4th Week of August

NOTE: Steps 8-19 below delineate the process to be employed for new alternative programs or extensions of existing alternatives. The development of an appropriate process for handling other means for reconciling racial isolation is at the discretion of the Superintendent and staff.

8. The Superintendent [or his designee(s)] shares information pertaining to the proposed program concepts, site requirements, the process for applying for site consideration, and the timeline for applications with:

   a) principals and LSACs of all schools who then share the information with all parents;

   b) the Facilitator of the Settlement Agreement, who then shares the information with the Communitywide Task Force; and

   c) community council presidents who will be asked to share the information with their members.

1st Week of September

9. The Communitywide Task Force, school communities, and community councils may submit written reactions concerning the proposed program concepts to the Superintendent.

4th Week of September

10. The Cabinet and the Board review all reactions.

1st Week of October

11. Publicity regarding program concepts, including the implications of becoming an alternative school, and the date of the Board public hearing are widely distributed.

2nd-3rd Week of October

12. The Board conducts a public hearing at a special session regarding programs, the basic guidelines and implications of becoming an alternative school, and site requirements.

4th Week of October

13. Schools are reminded of the process, including the basic guidelines and implications of becoming an alternative school, and deadline for applying for consideration as alternative site.

4th Week of October

14. Interested school communities through their principals and LSAC may submit an application for site of a proposed program concept to the Superintendent. The application must contain assurances that the community understands the implications of becoming an alternative school.

1st Week of November

15. The Superintendent [or his designee(s)] shares a complete list of all site applicants with:

    a) principals and LSACs of all schools who then share the information with all parents;

    b) the facilitator of the settlement agreement, who then shares the information with the Communitywide Task Force; and

    c) community council presidents who will be asked to share the information with their members.

2nd Week of November

16. The Communitywide Task Force, school communities, and community councils may submit written reactions concerning the site recommendations to the Superintendent.

4th Week of November

17. The Superintendent reviews all reactions and site applications, and makes his recommendations for programs and sites to the Board at a publicized public meeting, having first shared his intentions with the principals of the schools to be recommended and the principals of all schools who have applied and the facilitator of the settlement agreement.

1st Week of December

18. The Board considers the community reactions and the recommendations of the Superintendent and approves programs, budgets, and sites.

2nd Week of December

19. The Central Office staff, with input from the selected site staff as much as possible, completes the program development.

1st Week of January
through the 4th Week
of August

20. Parents/students may apply to programs in the following sequence:

a) priority period for students from identified racially impacted schools

January 1-January 23

b) priority period for siblings of students currently enrolled in alternatives

January 24-February 1

c) regular enrollment period

Feburary 1-April 30

(Enrollment continues throughout the year. However, parents are encouraged to apply by April 30 so that classes may be scheduled and transportation arranged for the following year.)

21. The site staff, with Central Office assistance, implements the program.

1st Week of September

Approved by Board of Education
October 14, 1985

APPENDIX C

Evaluation
Branch

OPEN ENROLLMENT EVALUATION

1984-85

By Mary Gladden

August, 1985

Cincinnati Public Schools
Office of the Superintendent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ii

Introduction 1

Program Evaluation
    Data Sources 3
    Enrollment and Location. 3
    Achievement Status 3
    Achievement Gains. 7
    Attitudes 9

Summary 16

Tables
1. Open Enrollment Students, 1983-84 and 1984-85. 3

2. CAT Total Reading and Total Math Stanine Distribution and Percent At and Above National Norm for Open Enrollment Programs, By Schools, Spring, 1985. 5

3. Comparison of Stanine Groupings Between the Non-Alternative School, Alternative Programs and Open Enrollment in Reading and Math, 1984 6

4. Normal Curve Equivalents Status and Gains, California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Matched and Promoted Alternative Students by Program and Location, April, 1984 and March-April, 1985. 8

5. Rank Order Summary of Average Scores on the May, 1985 Open Enrollment Parent Survey by School Level. 11

6. Comparison of Similar Items on Three Parent Surveys. . . .13

Appendices. 15

Executive Summary

The data in this report indicate that 1,205 students participated in the Open Enrollment program during the 1984-85 school year. The racial composition of these students was 97.6% Black, and 2.4% White, and the total number was 92 higher than the previous year's total. There were thirty-seven schools with one or more open enrollment students.

Results on standardized achievement tests in reading and mathematics show fewer open enrollment students proportionately in the above average stanines, more open enrollment students in the average stanines and approximately the same percentage of open enrollment and non-alternative students in the low stanine categories. Additional test results indicate that open enrollment, alternative, and non-alternative students all had NCE losses in both reading and math and that open enrollment students had smaller losses than the other two groups.

Data from the survey of open enrollment parents indicate that they hold positive attitudes toward many aspects of the open enrollment program and that 86% are glad they sent their child to an open enrollment school. As a group, however, these parents respond less positively than other parents to questions about fair treatment of their child at school and about discipline and interracial understanding at their child's school.

REPORT ON THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM
1984-85

Introduction

Open Enrollment is a program in the Cincinnati Public Schools that permits parents to enroll their children at any school in the system so long as it helps the racial balance of the receiving school and does not hurt the racial balance of the sending school.

Open Enrollment began in the 1973-74 school year with secondary students only. Elementary students were added to the program during the 1974-75 school year.

In its first year, open enrollment served as the vehicle for enrolling students into the City-Wide and Peoples Alternative Programs. At this time, there was no mechanism to enroll alternative students. During the 1973-74 school year, the Open Enrollment Program transferred 78 Black students from all over the city to Peoples in grades 7, 8 and 9 and transferred 63 white students from all over the city to the Hughes City-Wide Program in grades 9, 10, 11 and 12. During this first year, 30 students who did not meet the requirements were rejected from open enrollment.

In the second year of open enrollment, 90 Black elementary students and 1 white student received transfers. Four elementary schools received most of these first students. They were Clifton, College Hill, Kilgour and Pleasant Ridge. A total of 567 Black secondary students were transferred through open enrollment during its second year. The majority of those students attended Peoples, Dater, Eastern Hills, Roberts, Gamble and Western Hills.

In its second year, 1974-75, open enrollment established the pattern it is known for today of primarily being a vehicle for Black students to transfer to White schools with very few, if any, White students taking advantage of the open enrollment opportunity.

In spite of its one-way appeal, open enrollment has continued to grow and thrive and has been a very effective way of reducing isolation in the system's racially impacted White schools.

During the 1984-85 school year, 1,205 students were enrolled in schools under open enrollment with the overwhelming majority of them being Black.

The 1984 Bronson Settlement Agreement between the Cincinnati Board of Education and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People states specifically that the current open enrollment program will remain in place to assist in the reduction of racial isolation.

The Settlement Agreement further states that CPS will undertake to inform all students of the availability of open enrollment transfers with a concentrated effort directed to eligible students in schools which reflect racial isolation. CPS will also establish recruitment and counseling centers (Alternative Program Information Centers) to help develop and distribute information for students and parents regarding the opportunities under the open enrollment policy. Two centers have been established at Douglass and Millvale Elementary Schools and four people have been hired to distribute information and make presentations to students on open enrollment. The present open enrollment policy and application are included in this report as exhibits (see Appendix A).

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this report is to bring together all the facts and figures known about open enrollment, and to report the achievement test scores and survey data available for the program. Summaries of the data collected in this evaluation effort are presented and discussed in the following sections.

Data Sources

Data for this report have been obtained from various sources. Enrollment and racial composition are reported by the Open Enrollment Division of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. California Achievement Test data are maintained by the Testing Section of the Evaluation Branch. Attitude surveys are administered through the School Information System in Testing Section.

Enrollment

Enrollment and racial composition as of November, 1984 are shown in Table 1. The source is enrollment data on file in the Open Enrollment Office at that time. Table 1 data indicates that a total of 506 elementary students were enrolled in open enrollment schools for the 1984-85 school year and that all but 17 of these students were Black. Table 1 data also indicates that 699 secondary students were enrolled in open enrollment schools for the 1984-85 school year and that all but 14 of these students were Black. That represents a grand total of 1,205 open enrollment students for 1984-85 with 1,174 Black and 31 White students. This was an increase of 92 students over enrollment in the 1983-84 school year.

Table 1. The Enrollment and Racial Composition of Open Enrollment Students by Level and Year.

	Number of Students by Level					
	Elementary		Secondary		Combined	
School Year	Total	% Black	Total	% Black	Total	% Black
1983-84	410	93.6%	703	98.3%	1,113	96.6%
1984-85	506	96.6%	699	98.0%	1,205	97.4%

Achievement Status

California Achievement Tests were administered in March-April, 1985 to all students in grades 1 through 11, including students in open enrollment programs. Computerized analyses of the test data made it possible to determine results separately for open enrollment students (see Tables 2-4).

Table 2 shows the CAT reading and math stanine distributions and the percent at and above the national norm for open enrollment students. Each school with at least one open enrollment student is listed in the table whether or not there is available data in each category. Several schools stand out at both the elementary and secondary levels as having the greatest percentage of open enrollment students. They are Cheviot, Covedale, Hartwell, Hyde Park, Kilgour, Losantiville and Westwood at the elementary level, and Dater and Western Hills at the high school level. These schools, as well as all others with open enrollment students, should be commended for their efforts in successfully attracting open enrollment students.

Table 2. CAT Total Reading and Total Math Stanine Distribution and Percent At and Above National Norm For Open Enrollment Programs, By Schools, Spring, 1985.

Open Enrollment School	Stanine Category						At and Above National Norm Total Program N (%)	
	Below Average (1-3) N (%)		Average (4-6) N (%)		Above Average (7-9) N (%)			
	TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM	TR	TM
Aiken	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	2 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)
Anderson Place	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)
Central Fairmount	3 (42.9)	4 (50.0)	4 (57.1)	3 (37.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (12.5)	1 (14.3)	4 (50.0)
Cheviot	8 (17.8)	8 (17.8)	35 (77.8)	31 (68.9)	2 (4.4)	6 (13.3)	18 (40.0)	20 (44.4)
Covedale	7 (15.2)	10 (21.3)	37 (80.4)	34 (72.3)	2 (4.3)	3 (6.4)	16 (34.8)	13 (27.7)
Dater	57 (32.4)	31 (18.0)	114 (64.8)	134 (77.9)	5 (2.8)	7 (4.1)	57 (32.4)	69 (40.1)
Gamble	0 (0.0)	1 (25.0)	4 (100.0)	3 (75.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (50.0)
Hartwell	6 (15.8)	4 (10.5)	27 (71.1)	28 (73.7)	5 (13.2)	6 (15.8)	20 (52.6)	22 (57.9)
Hays	2 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (33.3)	3 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (33.3)
Hyde Park	9 (20.5)	9 (20.9)	27 (61.4)	28 (65.1)	8 (18.2)	6 (14.0)	23 (52.3)	18 (41.9)
Kilgour	2 (4.3)	1 (2.2)	25 (54.3)	34 (73.9)	19 (41.3)	11 (23.9)	37 (80.4)	32 (69.6)
Kirby Road	2 (22.2)	1 (11.1)	5 (55.6)	7 (77.8)	2 (22.2)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	8 (88.9)
Losantiville	0 (0.0)	1 (2.7)	23 (62.2)	19 (51.4)	14 (37.8)	17 (45.9)	32 (86.5)	31 (83.8)
Midway	0 (0.0)	1 (20.0)	5 (100.0)	4 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (60.0)	3 (60.0)
Mt. Airy	3 (15.8)	6 (31.6)	14 (73.7)	13 (68.4)	2 (10.5)	0 (0.0)	10 (52.6)	6 (31.6)
Mt. Washington	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
North Fairmount	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0).	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Oyler	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	2 (100.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Peoples	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)
Pleasant Ridge	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	2 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Porter	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Quebec Heights	2 (18.2)	3 (27.3)	8 (72.7)	6 (54.5)	1 (9.1)	2 (18.2)	6 (54.5)	4 (36.4)
Roberts	7 (21.9)	9 (28.1)	25 (78.1)	22 (68.8)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.1)	7 (21.9)	9 (28.1)
Roll Hill	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Roosevelt	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)	4 (57.1)	4 (57.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)	3 (42.9)
Roselawn	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Rothenberg	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Sawyer	1 (33.3)	1 (50.0)	2 (66.7)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (33.3)	1 (50.0)
Schwab	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Shroder	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Taft High	6 (75.0)	4 (50.0)	2 (25.0)	4 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Western Hills	50 (27.9)	52 (29.2)	123 (68.7)	118 (66.3)	6 (3.4)	8 (4.5)	48 (26.8)	42 (23.6)
Westwood	15 (17.2)	12 (14.1)	63 (72.4)	65 (76.5)	9 (10.3)	8 (9.4)	39 (44.8)	41 (48.2)
Whittier	0 (0.0)	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)
Windsor	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
Withrow	2 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Woodward	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (100.0)	7 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (50.0)	3 (42.9)
Summary Data (Gr. 1-11)	188 (22.7)	166 (24.1)	570 (66.2)	579 (58.9)	78 (8.4)	83 (14.3)	335 (38.7)	340 (40.1)

Table 3 presents a comparison of the reading and math stanine groupings of open enrollment students with those of non-alternative students and those of the alternative students. Open enrollment and neighborhood students had similar percentages of students in the low stanine groupings (1-3), with approximately twenty percent of their students in this group. As can be seen from Table 3, the Open Enrollment program had a higher percentage of average students than either the non-alternative schools or the alternative programs in reading, and a slightly lower number in math. The non-alternative schools proportionately had twice as many above average students as did open enrollment, and the alternative programs had three times as many.

This information indicates that open enrollment is not taking only the lowest level students and sending them to other schools; rather, the open enrollment program has a representative cross-section of all stanine groupings and is especially strong in average stanine students. The fact that the non-alternative schools have twice as many above average stanine students as open enrollment, also indicates that many bright students are opting to remain at their neighborhood school.

Table 3. Comparison of Stanine Groupings Between the Non-Alternative School, Alternative Programs and Open Enrollment in Reading and Math, 1984-85.

	Below Average Stanines 1-3				Average Stanines 4-6				Above Average Stanines 7-9			
	TR		TM		TR		TM		TR		TM	
Schools	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Non-Alt.	5049	(21)	4695	(19)	14769	(61)	14390	(60)	4370	(18)	5013	(21)
Alt.	1210	(11)	1075	(9)	7030	(63)	6741	(61)	2945	(26)	3304	(30)
Open Enrl.	188	(23)	166	(24)	570	(66)	579	(59)	78	(8)	83	(14)

Achievement Gains, Matched Promoted Students, Normal Curve Equivalents

Table 4 presents achievement gain data in normal curve equivalents (NCEs) for the open enrollment student population. These data are derived from the results of two years of testing with the California Achievement Tests. Promoted students in open enrollment tested in April 1984 and again in March and April, 1985, are included in this study. NCE gains are shown for grades 2-11 but not for grade 1.

In reviewing NCE data, it is important to understand that if students maintain their NCE scores from year to year (resulting in a gain of 0), they are meeting the expected achievement level. An increase in average NCEs from one testing date to another would indicate that more than expected achievement growth had occurred. Conversely, losses in average NCEs indicate less than expected achievement as compared to the norm group. In addition, a gain of NCEs represents exactly the same amount of expected performance improvement for pupils at the extreme low end of the achievement distribution as it does for the average and above average achievers. NCEs are sensitive to small gains making the data more precise in reflecting achievement gains or losses.

It can be seen from the data in Table 4 that the average NCE gain was -.7 in reading and -1.5 in mathematics. These results indicate that students in open enrollment did not meet expected achievement gains in these important basic skills. However, the losses in NCE gain shown by open enrollment students from 1984 to 1985 are less than the losses shown by students in alternative and non-alternative programs, indicating that open enrollment students made better progress overall in achievement than students in these other programs.

Table 4. Normal Curve Equivalents Status and Gains, California Achievement Tests, Total Reading and Total Math, Matched and Promoted Open Enrollment Students by Schools, April, 1984 and March-April, 1985.

	Total Reading				Total Math			
School	Avg. NCE 1984	Avg. NCE 1985	NCE Gain*	N	Avg. NCE 1984	Avg. NCE 1985	NCE Gain*	N
Aiken	26.0	41.0	15.0	1	39.0	25.0	-14.0	1
Anderson Place	90.0	84.0	- 6.0	2	99.0	99.0	0.0	2
Central Fairmount	31.8	33.5	1.8	4	38.8	37.3	- 1.5	4
Cheviot	46.4	45.1	- 1.4	42	51.3	47.3	- 4.0	42
Covedale	47.4	43.9	- 3.9	40	50.1	42.4	- 8.0	41
Dater	44.4	42.0	- 2.4	160	47.1	46.5	- .5	160
Gamble	51.0	42.7	- 8.3	3	45.3	48.0	2.7	3
Hartwell	57.5	52.7	- 4.8	29	59.8	54.7	- 5.1	29
Hays	37.0	36.7	- .3	3	45.0	47.3	2.3	3
Hyde Park	47.8	47.1	- .7	28	48.7	43.1	- 5.1	26
Kilgour	61.3	58.6	- 2.7	29	56.6	55.1	- 1.4	29
Kirby Road	61.8	60.4	- 1.4	5	64.0	63.6	- .4	5
Losantiville	63.2	62.6	- .6	34	62.8	65.0	2.2	34
Midway	41.2	51.2	10.0	5	53.0	52.6	- .4	5
Mt. Airy	44.4	49.5	5.1	15	38.0	40.4	2.4	15
Mt. Washington	66.0	57.0	- 9.0	1	64.0	72.0	8.0	1
North Fairmount	50.0	55.0	5.0	1	75.0	82.0	7.0	1
Oyler	---	---	---	0	---	---	---	0
Peoples	54.0	49.5	- 4.5	2	65.5	51.0	-15.0	2
Pleasant Ridge	32.5	41.0	8.5	2	36.5	39.0	2.5	2
Porter	---	---	---	0	---	---	---	0
Quebec Heights	44.8	43.3	- 1.5	6	54.8	49.2	- 5.7	6
Roberts	43.1	39.7	- 3.6	25	41.6	37.8	- 4.6	25
Roll Hill	---	---	---	0	---	---	---	0
Roosevelt	48.0	38.5	- 9.5	4	48.8	43.8	- 5.0	4
Roselawn	44.0	44.0	0.0	1	49.0	43.0	- 6.0	1
Rothenberg	31.0	28.0	- 3.0	1	23.0	27.0	4.0	1
Sawyer	42.7	41.7	- 1.0	3	52.7	41.0	-18.0	2
Schwab	---	---	---	0	---	---	---	0
Shroder	---	---	---	0	---	---	---	0
Taft High	42.0	32.8	- 9.2	5	40.4	34.8	- 5.6	5
Western Hills	45.4	41.8	- 3.4	149	44.8	41.3	- 3.7	148
Westwood	50.8	46.9	- 3.9	69	53.5	47.4	- 6.6	68
Whittier	44.0	54.0	10.0	2	33.0	58.0	25.0	2
Windsor	49.0	53.0	4.0	1	50.0	57.0	7.0	1
Withrow	---	---	---	0	---	---	---	0
Woodward	52.6	50.0	- .7	6	52.9	46.4	- 6.5	6
Summary Data (Gr. 2-11)	48.1	47.4	- .7	678	51.1	49.6	- 1.5	674
Number of Matched Promoted Students		678				674		

---

* Gains can be reported only for students in grades 2 through 11.

Parent Attitudes Toward Open Enrollment

During May, 1985, the Evaluation Branch conducted a survey of open enrollment parents to determine their attitudes toward this program. A total of 223 (approximately 25%) parents of open enrollment students returned survey forms. A summary of the responses is presented in Table 5. Results are discussed below for key items on this survey.

Quality of Education. Items 4, 6, 10 and 13 were asked to determine how open enrollment parents feel about the education their children are receiving. Seventy-six percent of the open enrollment parents responding were satisfied with the quality of education, teaching and communication at their child's school. Furthermore, these parents felt that their children were receiving a better education through open enrollment than that offered in the neighborhood school. These findings indicate that open enrollment parents are satisfied with the quality of education their children are receiving and feel that it is an improvement over their previous school.

School Climate. Six items comprise the school climate factor, (1, 3, 12, 16, 17 and 18). Three items were given ratings of 61% or less and seemed to indicate that some open enrollment parents are concerned about student interracial understanding whether or not teachers take a personal interest in their child and whether the child speaks positively about most of his school experiences.

Three other items had ratings ranging from a low of 70% to a high of 88% and indicated that parents feel welcome and free to contact the teachers at their child's open enrollment school. A very favorable indicator is that 83% of open enrollment parents say their child looks forward to attending school each day.

Discipline/Safety. Approximately seventy percent of open enrollment parents feel that their child is treated fairly in school, that their child's school has good discipline and that their child is safe in the school's immediate neighborhood.

The ratings by open enrollment parents regarding fair treatment of students and school discipline are somewhat lower than the response of other parents in the system and would suggest that more needs to be done to provide the open enrollment parent with the knowledge that their child is being treated fairly and that the open enrollment school is well disciplined (see Table 6).

Open Enrollment Support. Eighty percent of all open enrollment parents responding to the survey were glad they had sent their child to an open enrollment school and plan for their child to return to that same school next year. Forty-eight percent of these parents had more than one child in open enrollment

These highly positive items are very supportive of the open enrollment concept and are an indication that parents want this option for their child's education.

Table 5. Summary of Responses, Open Enrollment Parent Survey, May, 1985.

ITEM	Percent of YES Responses			
	ELEM (134)	JUNIOR HIGH (41)	SENIOR HIGH (40)	TOTAL PARENTS (223)
1. Do you feel welcome at the school your child attends?	92%	76%	88%	88%
2. Are you glad you sent your child to an open enrollment school?	90%	76%	81%	86%
3. Does your child look forward to attending school each day?	88%	76%	77%	83%
4. Are you satisfied with the quality of education your child is receiving in the Open Enrollment Program?	82%	80%	83%	82%
5. Does your child get along well with other children in his open enrollment school?	85%	71%	81%	82%
6. Are you satisfied with the quality of teaching at your child's school?	87%	81%	67%	81%
7. Are you satisfied with your child's transportation to his Open Enrollment School?	82%	73%	75%	79%
8. Have you visited your child's Open Enrollment School this year?	82%	66%	69%	76%
9. Do you plan for your child to return to the same Open Enrollment School next year?	77%	66%	73%	74%
10. Are you satisfied with the amount of communication on your child's academic progress?	74%	73%	69%	73%
11. Do you think your child is treated fairly at school?	76%	59%	73%	72%
12. Do you feel free to contact the teacher or someone else if you have a question or problem?	72%	71%	65%	70%
13. Do you feel your child is receiving a better education in Open Enrollment than that offered in the neighborhood school?	75%	56%	67%	70%
14. Does your child's school have good discipline?	75%	51%	60%	67%
15. Do you feel your child is safe in the school's immediate neighborhood?	72%	51%	58%	66%
16. Does your child speak positively about most of his school experiences?	67%	54%	52%	61%
17. Do you believe your child's teachers take a personal interest in him?	63%	56%	31%	55%
18. Do you think there is a good student interracial understanding in your child's school?	63%	39%	42%	54%
19. Does your child participate in any extracurricular activities at his open enrollment school?	51%	49%	42%	48%
20. Do you have more than one child attending an Open Enrollment School?	53%	46%	35%	48%
21. Are you an active member of the school's parent organization?	23%	12%	13%	19%

Table 6 shows a comparison of responses to similar items between open enrollment parents in May, 1985 and all other parents surveyed on the November, 1984 School Information System Survey. It can be seen from these data that responses by open enrollment parents are comparable on questions about quality of teaching, child's safety in the neighborhood, and feeling welcome at the school. Open enrollment parents, however, answer less positively on the other comparable items.

The areas in which open enrollment parents gave significantly lower ratings than did other parents may be a cause for concern. They have not visited their child's school as often as other parents, they do not think their child is treated as fairly as other parents and they do not feel as free to contact the teacher or someone else. Of particular concern, is that only 61% of open enrollment parents say that their child speaks positively about most of his school experiences, that only 55% believe that their child's teachers take a personal interest in them and that only 54% believe that there is good student interracial understanding in their child's school.

The distance open enrollment children have to travel to school is undoubtedly one reason why parents do not visit as often as parents in other programs and may be the reason why open enrollment parents do not feel as much a part of their child's school as parents in other programs. It is clear that steps must be taken by open enrollment schools to make both students and parents feel welcome and a part of the school. Parents need a better understanding of measures taken to insure good discipline, fair treatment of all students and good student interracial understanding.

Table 6. Comparison of Similar Items on Three Parent Surveys, 1984-85.

Item	Percent of YES Responses All Parents	Alternative Parents	Open Enrollment Parents
Do you feel welcome at your child's school?	91%	93%	88%
Have you visited your child's school this year?	86%	88%	76%*
Do you think your child is treated fairly?	83%	85%	72%*
Do you feel free to contact the teacher or someone else if you have a question or problem?	94%	95%	70%*
Does your child's school have good discipline?	74%	79%	67%
Does your child speak positively about most of his school experiences?	82%	87%	61%*
Do you believe your child's teachers take a personal interest in him/her?	65%	69%	55%*
Do you think there is good student interracial understanding in your child's school?	61%	69%	54%
Are you satisfied with the quality of teaching at your child's school?	78%	84%	78%
Do you feel your child is safe in the school's immediate neighborhood?	64%	63%	66%

*Significantly lower than ratings by all parents in the system.

Summary

The Open Enrollment program increased its members by 92 students during the 1984-85 school year for a total of 1,205 students.

California Achievement Test results comparing open enrollment, alternative and non-alternative students reveal approximately the same percentages of students in the below average stanine groupings for open enrollment and non-alternative students and a larger percentage of open enrollment students at the average stanines than for alternative and non-alternative groups. Open enrollment has a much smaller representation at the higher stanine groupings than do alternative and non-alternative students. Overall, open enrollment students show less of an NCE loss than either alternative or non-alternative students in both reading and math.

Results of the parent surveys indicate that open enrollment parents are satisfied with the quality of education offered by the open enrollment school and that a high percentage of parents plan for their child to attend the same school for the next school year. Compared with other parents, however, open enrollment parents do not feel as comfortable with fair treatment, discipline and interracial understanding at their child's school.

Approved by:
Joseph F. Gastright, Director
Evaluation Branch

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

REGULATIONS REGARDING THE TRANSFER OF STUDENTS UNDER THE OPEN ENROLLMENT POLICY
1984-85

1. Upon requests of parents, transfers will be granted to certain schools having available space. Such transfers will be granted only where the transfer improves the racial balance of the receiving school and does not adversely affect the racial balance of the district/sending school. The only exception to this regulation shall be for pupils who reside within the attendance zone of an alternative school. Upon parent request, pupils assigned to these schools may be given a transfer to another school if the transfer improves the racial balance of the receiving school. Current neighborhood/alternative schools are Chase Intermediate, Clifton, North Avondale, Oyler (grades 4-6), Silverton, and Woodford. A list of eligible receiving schools indicating race will be published each year. Transfers will be accepted until all spaces in the receiving school have been filled.

2. All applications must be sent through the U.S. mail or delivered to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 6th floor, Education Center, 230 East Ninth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. Separate application forms must be completed for each student for whom a transfer is requested indicating first, second, and third choice of receiving schools. Applications must be signed by parent or guardian, and by principal or counselor of school in which pupil is now enrolled.

   For enrollment in an elementary or secondary school in September, 1984, applications must be submitted no later than April 30. Pupils applying after that date will be placed on a waiting list.

3. Applicants will be notified by letter as soon as possible as to whether their transfers have been approved or rejected. If the transfer has been approved, the student should enroll in the approved school through the local school principal or counselor. The principal or counselor is responsible for sending all records to the receiving school. If a transfer is granted and the parent or guardian does not wish to take advantage of the transfer, the parents are asked to notify the Department of Curriculum and Instruction immediately (Shirlee Williams - 369-4802).

4. Pupils accepting transfer will be expected to remain in the school assigned until completion of the grade levels available at that school. There must be a combined effort by the receiving school and parents of the transferred student to see that he/she continues in the receiving school. The student who is granted a transfer shall have the same rights, opportunities, and responsibilities as a resident student of the receiving school.

   Upon completion of the grade levels available at the school, a pupil will be assigned to the district school unless another open enrollment application is approved. Upon the request of parents, pupils may return to the district school. They will not be granted a transfer to a second school under open enrollment during the same school year.

5. The rules of the Ohio High School Athletic Association apply to the transfer of any student who has been a member of a varsity, reserve, junior high, or middle school athletic team. The superintendent of schools may authorize a transfer, in writing, with a copy being sent to the State Athletic Commissioner. The student who transfers under this open enrollment plan will be eligible to participate in the athletic program of the new school. However, the student can only be granted one such transfer, unless the athlete desires to return to his home school or there is a corresponding change in the address of the parent or guardian. Under any other circumstance, the pupil shall forfeit one year of eligibility. The one year of eligibility is interpreted to mean for one calendar year from the effective date of the second transfer.

6. In accordance with Board of Education policy, State law, and State Department guidelines, free or partially reimbursed transportation will be provided if possible to eligible students under the open enrollment plan in accordance with Board Policy 3541 (a).

7. A decrease or increase in enrollment could occur at a given school necessitating adjustments in the schools available for transfers under open enrollment. The superintendent of schools reserves the right to make the final decision regarding such changes.

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
January, 1984

APPENDIX B

For Official Use Only
Number of Request ____
Date Received ____

OPEN ENROLLMENT TRANSFER REQUEST FORM

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Cincinnati, Ohio
1984-85

For Official Use Only
Approved ____
Rejected ____
Waiting List ____

1. Name of Student: ____ Last First Middle Initial Date of Birth: ____

2. Address of Student: ____ Zip Code: ____

3. Name of Parent/Guardian: ____

4. Address of Parent/Guardian: ____

5. Telephone Number: ____ Sex: (Please circle) Male Female

6. Race of Student: (Please circle) Black White Other (Please indicate) ____

7. Grade Entering in September, 1984: (please circle) K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

8. Is the Student Presently in a Special Education Class: (Please circle) Yes No

9. School Presently Attending: ____

10. I wish to have my child transferred to: ____ First Choice ____ Second Choice ____ Third Choice

11. Applications must be submitted NO LATER THAN APRIL 30, 1984. Unless application is received by this date, transportation cannot be guaranteed for the first week of school.

12. Return this form by U.S. mail or deliver personally to Shirlee Williams, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 6th Floor, Education Center, 230 East Ninth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202. If you desire information or assistance in completing this form, please call 369-4802.

____ Date

____ Signature of Parent/Guardian Requesting Transfer

- -

FOR SCHOOL USE ONLY

The above pupil has participated in interscholastic athletics in this school in grades 9-12. Yes ____ No ____

The above pupil is now in a special education program. Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please indicate program ____

The above pupil is now enrolled in an alternative program. Yes ____ No ____

Pupil ID Number: ____

____ Date

____ Signature of Principal or Counselor of Sending School

[redacted]

APPENDIX C

OPEN ENROLLMENT
PARENT SURVEY

Instructions: Please use a soft lead pencil. Write in the name of the school your child attends and fill in the circle next to the grade of your oldest child in the Open Enrollment Program. Please complete the survey by filling in either Yes (Y) or No (N), or Undecided (U) next to each item. Return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. PLEASE DO NOT STAPLE OR TEAR THIS SHEET. THANK YOU.

xxxxxxxxxxx

1. Are you satisfied with the quality of education your child is receiving in the open enrollment program?

xxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxx

2. Does your child look forward to attending school each day?

3. Are you glad you sent your child to an open enrollment school?

4. Do you plan for your child to return to the same open enrollment school next year?

xxxxxxxxxxx

5. Are you an active member of the school's parent organization?

6. Does your child participate in any extra curricular activities at his open enrollment school?

xxxxxxxxxxx

7. Have you visited your child's open enrollment school this year?

8. Do you feel welcome at the school your child attends?

9. Are you satisfied with the amount of communication on your child's academic progress?

xxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxx

10. Does your child speak positively about most of his school experiences?

11. Do you feel free to contact the teacher or someone else at school if you have a question or problem?

xxxxxxxxxxx

12. Do you feel your child is receiving a better education in open enrollment than that offered in the neighborhood school?

xxxxxxxxxxx

13. Do you think there is a good student interracial understanding in your child's school?

xxxxxxxxxxx

14. Do you think your child is treated fairly at school?

xxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxx

15. Are you satisfied with the quality of teaching at your child's school?

16. Do you believe your child's teachers take a personal interest in him?

xxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxx

	Yes	No	Undecided
17. Do you have more than one child attending an open enrollment school?	○	○	○
18. Are you satisfied with your child's transportation to his open enrollment school?	○	○	○
19. Does your child get along well with other students in his open enrollment school?	○	○	○
20. Do you feel your child is safe in school's immediate neighborhood?	○	○	○
21. Does your child's school have good discipline?	○	○	○

APPENDIX C

ELEMENTRARY SCHOOLS - OPEN ENROLLMENT
Applications Approved for 1985-86
as of November 15, 1985

No. of Students Transferring	To Receiving School	From District School	Grade K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Race B	W
5	TOTAL (Anderson Place)	11/13/84	1			3	1				5
1	Carson	Bond Hill						1		1	
1	Carson	Burton			1					1	
4	Carson	North Fairmount	1		1	1	1			4	
2	Carson	Roll Hill		1	1					2	
2	Carson	Winton Place		1	1					2	
10	TOTAL (Carson)		1	2	4	1	1	1		10	
6	TOTAL (Carson)	11/13/84	1	3			1		1	6	
1	Central Fairmount	Burton					1			1	
2	Central Fairmount	Heberle		1	1					2	
3	Central Fairmount	Roll Hill		1		1	1			3	
5	Central Fairmount	Rothenberg			2		1	2		5	
2	Central Fairmount	South Avondale			1	1				2	
1	Central Fairmount	Winton Place		1						1	
14	TOTAL (Central Fairmount)			3	4	2	3	2		14	
11	TOTAL (Central Fairmount)	11/13/84	1	3	2	3	1		1	11	
2	Cheviot	Chase					2			2	
1	Cheviot	Hoffman							1	1	
1	Cheviot	Millvale				1				1	
4	TOTAL (Cheviot)					1	2		1	4	
20	TOTAL (Cheviot)	11/13/84			6	6	3	3	2	20	
1	Covedale	Hoffman			1					1	
1	Covedale	Millvale			1					1	
1	Covedale	North Avondale					1			1	
1	Covedale	North Fairmount					1			1	
1	Covedale	Rockdale	1							1	
6	Covedale	Roll Hill	3			1	2			6	
1	Covedale	South Avondale							1	1	
1	Covedale	Washburn				1				1	
4	Covedale	Windsor					2	2		4	
17	TOTAL (Covedale)		4		2	2	6	2	1	17	
23	TOTAL (Covedale)	11/13/84		6	4	6	4		3	23	
2	Hartwell	Bond Hill			2					2	
4	Hartwell	Burton	1		1	1		1		4	
4	Hartwell	Chase					3		1	4	
2	Hartwell	Heberle			1	1				2	
2	Hartwell	Losantiville		2						2	
1	Hartwell	Millvale				1				1	
3	Hartwell	North Fairmount		1		1			1	3	
1	Hartwell	South Avondale	1							1	
3	Hartwell	Swifton	2	1						3	
2	Hartwell	Taft		2						2	
1	Hartwell	Vine				1				1	
21	Hartwell	Winton Place	4	10	2	5				21	

No. of Students Transferring	To Receiving School	From District School	Grade							Race	
			K	1	2	3	4	5	6	B	W
46	TOTAL (Hartwell)		8	16	6	10	3	1	2	46	
40	TOTAL (Hartwell)	11/13/84	5	8	10	4	5	3	5	40	
1	TOTAL (Hays)	11/13/84							1		1
1	Hyde Park	Hoffman	1							1	
11	Hyde Park	Kilgour	5	1	2	1		2			11
1	Hyde Park	Mt. Washington		1							1
1	Hyde Park	Windsor	1								1
14	TOTAL (Hyde Park)		7	2	2	1		2		1	13
36	TOTAL (Hyde Park)	11/13/84	3	5	6	4	8	6	4	36	
1	Kilgour	Anderson Place	1							1	
2	Kilgour	Bramble	1		1					2	
3	Kilgour	Burton	1				1	1		3	
8	Kilgour	Hoffman	3	1		1	3			8	
1	Kilgour	Parham	1							1	
1	Kilgour	Pleasant Ridge					1			1	
2	Kilgour	Rockdale	1				1			2	
5	Kilgour	Silverton				1	1	1	2	5	
1	Kilgour	Woodford	1							1	
24	TOTAL (Kilgour)		9	1	1	2	7	2	2	24	
28	TOTAL (Kilgour)	11/13/84	3	5	4	5	3	7	1	28	
1	Kirby Road	Heberle				1				1	
1	Kirby Road	Pleasant Hill	1							1	
3	Kirby Road	Roll Hill		2		1				3	
2	Kirby Road	South Avondale	2							2	
10	Kirby Road	Winton Place		6	2	2				10	
17	TOTAL (Kirby Road)		3	8	2	4				17	
6	TOTAL (Kirby Road)	11/13/84	1	1	3	1				6	
1	Losantiville	Bond Hill	1							1	
2	Losantiville	South Avondale	2							2	
3	TOTAL (Losantiville)		3							3	
20	TOTAL (Losantiville)	11/13/84	8	1	5	2	1	3		19	1
4	McKinley	Hoffman	1		1	2				4	
4	TOTAL (McKinley)		1		1	2				4	
1	TOTAL (McKinley)	11/13/84			1					1	
2	Midway	Hays		1		1				2	
1	Midway	North Fairmount	1							1	
2	Midway	Roll Hill	1	1						2	
2	Midway	Washington Park					1	1		2	
7	TOTAL (Midway)		2	2		1	1	1		7	
2	TOTAL (Midway)	11/13/84		2						2	

No. of Students Transferring	To Receiving School	From District School	Grade							Race	
			K	1	2	3	4	5	6	B	W
1	Mt. Airy	Winton Place		1						1	
1	TOTAL (Mt. Airy)			1						1	
6	TOTAL (Mt. Airy)	11/13/84		2	1	1	1		1	6	
1	Mt. Washington	Anderson Place					1			1	
2	Mt. Washington	Bramble						1	1	2	
1	Mt. Washington	Burton				1				1	
2	Mt. Washington	Hays				1		1		2	
4	Mt. Washington	Hoffman		1		1	1	1		4	
1	Mt. Washington	Kilgour		1						1	
2	Mt. Washington	Kirby Road		1	1					2	
1	Mt. Washington	North Avondale							1	1	
3	Mt. Washington	North Fairmount		3						3	
3	Mt. Washington	Parham				1	1	1		3	
1	Mt. Washington	Pleasant Ridge				1				1	
1	Mt. Washington	Roll Hill			1					1	
1	Mt. Washington	Silverton						1		1	
3	Mt. Washington	South Avondale		3						3	
1	Mt. Washington	Taft		1						1	
2	Mt. Washington	Washburn		1				1		2	
1	Mt. Washington	Washington Park				1				1	
1	Mt. Washington	Windsor		1						1	
6	Mt. Washington	Winton Place		4	2					6	
37	TOTAL (Mt. Washington)			16	4	6	3	6	2	37	
1	TOTAL (Mt. Washington) 11/13/84						1			1	
1	North Fairmount	Central Fairmount		1							1
1	North Fairmount	Quebec Heights						1			1
1	North Fairmount	Westwood							1		1
3	TOTAL (North Fairmount)			1				1	1		3
2	TOTAL (North Fairmount) 11/13/84		1	1							2
2	Oyler	Hays					1	1		2	
3	Oyler	Heberle	1			1			1	3	
1	Oyler	Rockdale							1	1	
6	TOTAL (Oyler)		1			1	1	1	2	6	
2	TOTAL (Oyler)	11/13/84		1			1			2	
1	Pleasant Hill	Hartwell						1		1	
1	TOTAL (Pleasant Hill)							1		1	
2	Quebec Heights	Bond Hill			1	1				2	
13	Quebec Heights	Burton	1	1	5		3	1	2	13	
1	Quebec Heights	Chase					1			1	
3	Qeubec Heights	Heberle				1	1	1		3	
4	Quebec Heights	Millvale		3	1					4	
1	Quebec Heights	North Avondale				1				1	
2	Quebec Heights	North Fairmount		1			1			2	

No. of Students Transferring	To Receiving School	From District School	Grade							Race	
			K	1	2	3	4	5	6	B	W
2	Quebec Heights	Parham			1				1	2	
1	Quebec Heights	Rockdale							1	1	
1	Quebec Heights	Roll Hill	1							1	
7	Quebec Heights	South Avondale		2	1	1	1	2		7	
3	Quebec Heights	Vine		1			1	1		3	
2	Quebec Heights	Winton Place		1		1				2	
42	TOTAL (Quebec Heights)		2	9	9	5	8	5	4	42	
9	TOTAL (Quebec Heights)	11/13/84	1	4	1		1	1	1	9	
2	Roosevelt	Heberle					1		1	2	
1	Roosevelt	Hoffman		1						1	
2	Roosevelt	Millvale		2						2	
1	Roosevelt	North Fairmount		1						1	
2	Roosevelt	Windsor	1		1					2	
8	TOTAL (Roosevelt)		1	4	1		1		1	8	
6	TOTAL (Roosevelt)	11/13/84		4	1	1				6	
3	Sayler Park	Vine		1		1		1		3	
1	Sayler Park	Winton Place		1						1	
4	TOTAL (Sayler Park)			2		1		1		4	
2	Westwood	North Fairmount	2							2	
5	Westwood	Roll Hill		2	2		1			5	
1	Westwood	Windsor				1				1	
8	TOTAL (Westwood)		2	2	2	1	1			8	
93	TOTAL (Westwood)	11/13/84	5	8	24	20	13	11	12	92	1
2	Whittier	Hays				1		1		2	
3	Whittier	Heberle		1				2		3	
1	Whittier	Roll Hill							1	1	
6	TOTAL (Whittier)			1		1		3	1	6	
3	TOTAL (Whittier)	11/13/84	1		1			1		3	
276	GRAND TOTAL		44	70	38	41	37	29	17	259	17
321	GRAND TOTAL	11/13/84	31	54	69	56	44	35	32	311	10

REJECTION LETTERS SENT - 152

SECONDARY SCHOOLS - OPEN ENROLLMENT
Applications Approved for 1985-86 School Year
as of November 15, 1985

No. of Students Transferring	To Receiving School	From District School	Grade 7	8	9	10	11	12	Race B	W
2	Aiken	Western Hills			1		1			2
2	TOTAL (Aiken)				1		1			2
2	TOTAL (Aiken)	11/13/84				1		1		2
2	Dater	Aiken			2				2	
29	Dater	Bloom	26	2	1				29	
7	Dater	Crest Hills	6	1					7	
26	Dater	Gamble	24	2					26	
2	Dater	Hughes			2				2	
19	Dater	Merry	16	3					19	
1	Dater	Peoples	1						1	
12	Dater	Porter	10	1	1				12	
18	Dater	Sawyer	5	9	4				18	
11	Dater	Schwab	9	2					11	
4	Dater	Shroder	3		1				4	
1	Dater	Woodward			1				1	
132	TOTAL (Dater)		100	20	12				132	
107	TOTAL (Dater)	11/13/84	83	11	13				107	
2	Gamble	Roberts	1	1						2
2	TOTAL (Gamble)		1	1						2
2	TOTAL (Gamble)	11/13/84	1	1					2	
2	Porter	Dater	2							2
4	Porter	Roberts	1	3						4
6	TOTAL (Porter)		3	3						6
6	TOTAL (Porter)	11/13/84	2	3	1					6
17	Roberts	Bloom	10	4	3				17	
2	Roberts	Crest Hills	1	1					2	
6	Roberts	Gamble	3	2	1				6	
6	Roberts	Hughes			6				6	
21	Roberts	Merry	15	6					21	
5	Roberts	Porter	3		2				5	
3	Roberts	Sawyer	1	2					3	
4	Roberts	Schwab	4						4	
1	Roberts	Withrow			1				1	
1	Roberts	Woodward			1				1	
66	TOTAL (Roberts)		37	15	14				66	
40	TOTAL (Roberts)	11/13/84	21	13	6				40	
1	TOTAL (Shroder)	11/13/84		1						1
1	Hughes	Western Hills				1				1
1	TOTAL (Hughes)					1				1

No. of Students Transferring	To Receiving School	From District School	Grade						Race	
			7	8	9	10	11	12	B	W
1	Taft	Western Hills					1			1
1	TOTAL (Taft)						1			1
1	TOTAL (Taft)	11/13/84						1		1
29	Western Hills	Aiken			14	11	1	3	29	
12	Western Hills	Bloom			12				12	
37	Western Hills	Hughes			17	10	7	3	37	
1	Western Hills	Porter			1				1	
3	Western Hills	Sawyer			3				3	
14	Western Hills	Shroder			14				14	
15	Western Hills	Taft				14	1		15	
21	Western Hills	Withrow			8	10	3		21	
25	Western Hills	Woodward			7	16	1	1	25	
157	TOTAL (Western Hills)				76	61	13	7	157	
271	TOTAL (Western Hills)	11/13/84			96	123	40	12	271	
1	Woodward	Western Hills				1				1
1	TOTAL (Woodward)					1				1
1	TOTAL (Woodward)	11/13/84			1					1
368	GRAND TOTAL		141	39	103	63	15	7	355	13
431	GRAND TOTAL	11/13/84	107	29	117	124	40	14	420	11

REJECTION LETTERS SENT - 132

APPENDIX D

DRAFT

APPENDIX D

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM

Department of Student Services
230 East Ninth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

January, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. POLICY ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY.............. 1

II. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION........................ 2

III. RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION.................. 3

IV. UTILIZATION ANALYSIS................................ 3

TABLE 1.. 4

V. ESTABLISHMENT OF GOALS AND TIMETABLES............... 4

TABLE 2.. 5

TABLE 3.. 6

TABLE 4.. 7

Summary of Utilization Analysis...................... 8

VI. DEVELOPMENT AND EXECUTION OF PROGRAM................ 8

A. Selection... 8

B. Training.. 9

C. Promotions.. 10

D. Compensation...................................... 10

E. Leave Policies.................................... 10

F. Fringe Benefits................................... 10

G. Maternity Benefits................................ 10

VII. SUPPORT OF ACTION................................. 11

VIII. INTERNAL REPORTS................................. 12

APPENDIX A... 13

APPENDIX B... 14

I. POLICY ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The subject of affirmative action has been changing and expanding over the years through legislation and greater social awareness. As a result of these changes, the Board of Education, hereinafter referred to as the Board, believes that it is appropriate to restate its basic policy on equal employment opportunity to all interested parties and to establish an Affirmative Action Program. The Board will make a good faith effort to achieve the specific goals to which it is committed.

It has been and will continue to be the policy of the Board to provide equal employment opportunity to all applicants for employment; and to administer all personnel practices such as recruiting, hiring, promotions, and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment in a manner which does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age (40-70), handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era.

The Board is committed to providing quality integrated education for all students. Included within this commitment is the identification and control of the major variables, including racial and sexual representation in employee groups. This commitment embraces the belief that instructional programs, materials, Board policies and administrative procedures, which are supportive to quality integrated education for all students, can be developed when there is representative input from employees of all races and both sexes. The Board's basic policy statements on affirmative action and staff balance are attached as Appendices A and B.

Therefore, as goals of the Affirmative Action Program, the Board proposes:

1. To continue to obtain the commitment and active cooperation of all certificated and non-certificated employees to achieve the goals of equal employment opportunity;
2. To continue to modify and to improve employment programs to assure the adequate representation of employees of all races and both sexes throughout the district at all levels of employment;
3. To continue to cooperate with state and federal civil rights compliance agencies to insure equal employment opportunity;
4. To continue to utilize the administrative line organization to keep all employees informed of the Affirmative Action Program and to provide means by which all employees may submit suggestions, comments, and questions regarding the program;
5. To continue to insure that all parties with whom the Board contracts are in compliance with equal employment opportunity regulations.

II. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

A. Internal Dissemination:

1. Conduct special meetings with all supervisory personnel to explain the intent of the policy and the individual responsibility for its effective implementation;

2. Schedule special meetings with all employees to discuss the policy and to explain each individual employee's responsibility for its effective implementation;

3. Posting of the Board's policy statement on bulletin boards along with notices required to be posted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and other federal, state or city civil rights agencies.

B. External Dissemination:

1. Inform all recruiting sources in writing of the Board's policy, stipulating that these sources are expected to recruit and refer minority and female applicants for all positions listed;

2. Communicate to prospective employees the existence of the Affirmative Action Program.

III. RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Responsibility for overall development, implementation, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the Affirmative Action Program rests with the Affirmative Action Officer who is the Assistant Superintendent, Department of Student Services.

IV. UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Employee utilization analysis shall be conducted annually and will be based upon a data processing printout prepared on approximately January 1. The following data indicate the numbers of employees by job categories, race and sex as of October, 1984.

TABLE 1

Number and Percent of Employees by Job Category, Race and Sex

Job Categories	Minority	%	White	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total
Leadership, Certificated	93	37	158	63	149	59	102	41	251
Teacher and Teacher-Based, Certificated	928	31	2056	69	810	27	2174	73	2984
Leadership, Civil Service	6	15	34	85	28	70	12	30	40
Office and Clerical, Civil Service	134	27	359	73	20	4	473	96	493
Skilled, Civil Service	82	39	131	61	149	70	64	30	213
Semi-Skilled, Civil Service	486	52	441	48	184	20	743	80	927
Unskilled, Civil Service	504	63	295	37	393	49	406	51	799
Totals	2233	39	3474	61	1733	30	3974	70	5707

V. ESTABLISHMENT OF GOALS AND TIMETABLES

The Board reaffirms its commitment to the goal of full utilization of minority and female employees in all job categories and its commitment to recruit, hire, train and promote such employees. When implementing this Affirmative Action Program, the representation of minority and female employees in job categories in which under utilization may have occurred shall be improved on the basis of available vacancies.

The work force utilization of Board employees was compared with the Cincinnati Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (CSMSA) data, United States Bureau of Census, 1980, to determine which job groups may have been under utilized. These data are reported in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Representation of Minority and Female Board Employees Compared with Cincinnati Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area Data

Job Categories	Percent Minority Board Employee	CSMSA Standard	Percent Female Board Employee	CSMSA Standard
Leadership, Certificated	37	5.6	41	28.2
Teacher and Teacher-Based, Certificated	31	7.4	73	74.1
Leadership, Civil Service	15	5.6	30	28.2
Office and Clerical, Civil Service	27	9.3	96	97.7
Skilled, Civil Service	39	9.1	30	14.0
Semi-Skilled, Civil Service	52	16.0	80	36.5
Unskilled, Civil Service	63	20.6	51	48.9

Table 2 reflects that female and minority utilization meets or exceeds the federal contract compliance standard of 80% of full utilization in each of the Board's job categories.

In addition to the utilization analysis of the Board employees by comparison with the Cincinnati Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area data, a comparison of the Board's minority employee utilization was made with the utilization of minority persons employed in the City of Cincinnati by job category. (Based upon United States Bureau of Census, 1980.) These percentages are reflected in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Representation of Minority Board Employees Compared with Representation of Minority Persons Employed in the City of Cincinnati by Job Category

Job Categories	Percent of Minority Employees as of 10/84	Minority Participation Rate in City of Cincinnati by Job Category
Leadership, Certificated	37	14.6
Teacher and Teacher-Based, Certificated	31	25.9
Leadership, Civil Service	15	14.6
Office and Clerical, Civil Service	27	24.8
Skilled, Civil Service	39	26.6
Semi-Skilled, Civil Service	52	42.6
Unskilled, Civil Service	63	48.6

Table 3 reflects that minority representation of Board employees meets or exceeds 80% of full minority utilization in each job category, even where such utilization is measured against representation of minority persons employed in the City of Cincinnati.

Furthermore, as a restatement of the goals established in January, 1974 (see Appendix A), affirmative action shall continue to be taken to achieve a greater utilization of minority non-professional and administrative employees. Such utilization shall approximate the percentage that the adult minority population within the Cincinnati Public School District bears to the total adult population of the district (approximately 26.2% - University of Cincinnati Institute for Policy Research: 1980 census data).

TABLE 4

Job Category Goals for Greater Representation of Minority Board Employees Based Upon a Comparison with the Adult Minority Population Within the Cincinnati Public School District

Job Categories	Percent of Minority Employees as of 10/84	Percent of Adult Minority Population Cincinnati School District	Intermediate Goal 10/31/85
Leadership, Certificated	37	26.2	----
Teacher and Teacher-Based, Certificated	31	26.2	----
Leadership, Civil Service	15	26.2	17
Office and Clerical, Civil Service	28	26.2	----
Skilled, Civil Service	39	26.2	----
Semi-Skilled, Civil Service	52	26.2	----
Unskilled, Civil Service	63	26.2	----

Summary of Utilization Analysis

By application of the Board's voluntary standard of the adult minority population within the Cincinnati Public School District in Table 4, an under representation of minorities is reflected in the category of Leadership, Civil Service. Therefore, additional good faith effort will be made to strengthen minority representation among Leadership, Civil Service employees to meet that standard. An intermediate goal, based upon projected opportunities for improving minority representation, has been established and is presented in Table 4.

Adequate utilization of employees of all races and both sexes, whether through affirmative action goals or through the monitoring of existing programs for achieving representative utilization. shall continue to be a goal of this Affirmative Action Program.

VI. DEVELOPMENT AND EXECUTION OF PROGRAM

The Board, to secure and maintain its goal of equal employment opportunity, undertakes the following:

A. Selection - The Board will continue to implement procedural safeguards which assure that members of all races and both sexes who possess the requisite skills and talents are included in the search for persons to fill positions and that no bias enters into the selection process.

1. Recruitment - The Board will notify all colleges and universities at which it currently conducts on-campus interviews of its policy of equal employment opportunity. In addition, the Board will take reasonable precautions to insure that every college or university at

which on-campus interviews are conducted does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age (40-70), handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era in the selection of students or in the establishing of interviewing schedules. The Board will notify all other sources of personnel of its commitment to equal employment opportunity.

2. Advertisements - Any advertisements used by the Board will continue to be placed in media of general circulation and will continue to state that the Board is an equal opportunity employer.

3. Applications - The Board will continue to accept all applications for employment. Applications will remain active for one year.

4. Interviews - All interviews will be conducted in such a manner that there is no discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age (40-70), handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era.

5. Testing - The Civil Service Commission will be instructed to utilize as employment criteria only those tests of job skills which have been validated as job related.

B. Training - All training programs sponsored by the Board shall continue to be made available to all eligible employees without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age (40-70), handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era.

C. Promotions - All promotions shall continue to be based on individual merit without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age (40-70), handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era.

D. Compensation - The Board will continue to examine its policies and practices concerning compensation and will search for additional mechanisms to insure that there is fairness and equality of compensation throughout all levels. The Board reiterates its determination to investigate and correct, if they exist, all cases where questions of discrepancies traceable to discrimination based on race or sex might be raised.

E. Leave Policies - The leave policies of the Board including paid and unpaid leave for educational or professional purposes, sick leave, funeral leave, military leave, political leave, and personal leave are implemented without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age (40-70), handicap, or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era.

F. Fringe Benefits - The Board administers its fringe benefit programs (including medical, hospital, accident, life insurance and retirement benefits) to insure that these programs are not discriminatory.

G. Maternity Benefits - Pregnancy is justification for a leave of absence for a female employee. An employee is reinstated from a leave of absence for maternity to her former or substantially equivalent position without loss of seniority or accrued benefits. The Board's maternity leave policy is based solely on individual medical or job characteristics.

VII. SUPPORT OF ACTION

Recognizing the need to support those community agencies having programs designed to further equal employment opportunity, employees will continue to be encouraged to assist these community agencies which have had as one of their goals the training of minority and female applicants for employment and/or the placement of such individuals.

In furtherance of the Board's commitment to continue to insure that all parties with whom it contracts are in compliance with equal employment opportunity regulations, it shall be the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent, Business Services, to insure EEO contract compliance. In that regard, he shall be designated the EEO contract compliance officer and, in such capacity, shall coordinate his EEO functions with those of the Affirmative Action Officer.

The EEO contract compliance officer shall, in accordance with governmental regulations, require those persons who contract with the Board to comply with the following: (1) the equal opportunity clause (41 CFR 60-1.4); (2) the non-segregated facilities clause (41 CFR 60-1.8); (3) the utilization of minority business enterprises clause (41 CFR 1-1310-2(a)); (4) the minority business enterprises subcontracting program clause (41 CFR 1-1.1310-2(b)); (5) the listing of employment openings clause (41 CFR 50-250.2); (6) the employment of the handicapped clause (20 CFR 741.3).

VIII. INTERNAL REPORTS

Internal reports on the progress and effectiveness of the Affirmative Action Program will be prepared periodically by the Affirmative Action Officer and submitted to the Superintendent. In the event performance is unsatisfactory, with goals and objectives not being met, corrective action, where deemed necessary, will be recommended by the Affirmative Action Officer and, following review by the Superintendent, appropriate action taken.

APPENDIX A

BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING - January 14, 1974

ACTION MOTION NUMBER ONE - STAFF BALANCE

A. Teaching Staff Balance

Voluntary efforts are now underway for the balancing of teaching staffs in each school to approximate the racial balance of the teaching staff in the entire district. These voluntary efforts should be continued. However, if they do not achieve a balance in each school approximating the balance of the system as a whole, then the Superintendent is directed mandatorily to assign teachers on such a basis that each school, commencing September 1, 1974, will have a racial balance of teachers substantially approximating the balance of the teaching staff as a whole.

B. Non-Professional Staff

An immediate affirmative action program is instituted with respect to the employment of non-professional staff members of the school system, with the goal to be a racial balance throughout the non-professional staff approximating the adult racial balance of the school district itself.

C. Administrative Staff

An affirmative action program is instituted with the goal of substantially increasing the percentage of black administrators and supervisors in our school system. This program is in effect in times of reduction of staff as well as in times of staff increase.

The Superintendent is directed to make a progress report on the above items and report to the Board of Education by April 30, 1974.

APPENDIX B

BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING - March 18, 1974

STATEMENT TO CLARIFY POLICY ON STAFF BALANCING

For the benefit of easy reference we repeat here the Board of Education policy to achieve staff racial balance as it was passed on January 14, 1974.

Teaching Staff Balance

> Voluntary efforts are now under way for the balancing of teaching staffs in each school to approximate the racial balance of the teaching staff in the entire district. These voluntary efforts should be continued. However, if they do not achieve a balance in each school approximating the balance of the system as a whole, then the Superintendent is directed mandatorily to assign teachers on such a basis that each school, commencing September, 1974, will have a racial balance of teachers substantially approximating the balance of the teaching staff as a whole.

The 75-25% guideline developed of course is a bench mark and variations are necessary because of certification, other needs, and the different percentages in the elementary and secondary levels. To clarify these situations we request that the basis for calculating at the elementary level be the actual percentage of black teachers at the elementary level; that is, 28.4%, and at the secondary level, the actual percentage of black teachers, that is 23.7%. Variations from the above percentages should not exceed 5% above or below the base.(1)

---

1. For the 1985-86 school year, the general guideline shall be 34% for elementary level and 28% for the secondary level.

The policy we are discussing has nothing to do with the hiring of new teachers which shall include attempts to increase the percentage of black staff. It deals only with the current staff ratio. Both white and black teachers can be hired this year at both the elementary and secondary level. The administration is directed to make every attempt to maintain the experience level of teachers in those schools when a maximum turnover will occur.

We would call attention again to the flexibility which will occur as principals nominate key people to be exempt from the ratio and as the ratio is adjusted because of the impossibility of obtaining a properly certificated teacher of the race needed for a particular school.

Adjustment is obviously necessary in the time lines set up.

We propose that we work toward the percentages of 28.4% at the elementary level and 23.7% at the secondary level.(2)

(a) through voluntary teacher transfer until March 22, 1974 and through the hiring and assigning of new teachers up to September 1, 1974; and

(b) through mandatory teacher transfers after June 1, 1974 and before September 1, 1974 except where more than 20% of the teaching staff is to be transferred. In these latter situations no more than 20% of a school staff will be transferred in 1974. The remaining transfers will be accomplished by September 1, 1975 subject to the same 20% limitations.

---

2. For the 1985-86 school year, the general guideline shall be 34% for elementary level and 28% for the secondary level.

(c) providing extensive inservice training for teachers throughout the transfer process, particularly in schools where teacher transfers will exceed more than 20% of the teaching staff.

Cincinnati Public Schools
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
230 East Ninth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

February 26, 1985

To: Eastern Area Elementary Principals

From: Vella V. Ellis - Area Director

Re: Appraisal Conference and Plan a Timeline to Correct State Evaluation Violations, if any.

DATE	TIME	APPRAISEE
Tuesday March 19	1:00 p.m.	Gwen Robinson
	1:45 p.m.	John Knoechel
	2:30 p.m.	Frank Perry
	3:15 p.m.	Jane Patterson
Wednesday March 20	9:00 a.m.	Betty Buffington
	9:45 a.m.	Roscoe Mickle
	10:30 a.m.	Roman Walton
Thursday March 21	1:00 p.m.	Edwin Dawley
	1:45 p.m.	Ross Turpeau
	2:30 p.m.	William Thomas
	3:15 p.m.	Frederick Veidt
Friday March 22	9:00 a.m.	Patricia Surber
	9:45 a.m.	Donald Embs
	10:30 a.m.	Louise Stallworth
Monday March 25	1:00 p.m.	Janet Weingartner
	1:45 p.m.	Robert Gazaway
	2:30 p.m.	Tramble Evans
	3:15 p.m.	Frank Mack

DATE	TIME	APPRAISEE
Tuesday March 26	1:00 p.m. 1:45 p.m.	Benny Miles Clio Houp
Friday March 29	9:00 a.m. 9:45 a.m.	Emilie Shields Gwen Walton

fw

cc: Raymond J. Brokamp

BRING WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION REGARDING YOUR JOB TARGETS OR PERSONAL GOALS.

APPENDIX D

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

AN ANALYSIS OF STAFF
BY RACE AND SEX

A FIVE YEAR COMPARATIVE REPORT
1980-81 1981-82 1982-83 1983-84 1984-85

JANUARY, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE PAGE

INTRODUCTION iii

1 ALL EMPLOYEES 1

2 TOTAL CERTIFICATED STAFF 2

3 CERTIFICATED LEADERSHIP STAFF 3

4 OTHER NON-TEACHING CERTIFICATED STAFF 4

5 TEACHING STAFF 5

6 TOTAL CIVIL SERVICE STAFF 6

7 CIVIL SERVICE LEADERSHIP STAFF 7

8 NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE STAFF 8

9 NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION 1980-81 9

10 NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION 1981-82 10

11 NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION 1982-83 11

12 NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION 1983-84 12

13 NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION 1984-85 13

INTRODUCTION

The following data reflect the racial and sexual composition of employees by various groupings during the period from 1980-81 through 1984-85. Data for certificated employees are based upon the Staff Analysis for the second payroll period of the school year.

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE I
ALL EMPLOYEES

Category	1980-81 Number	1980-81 Percent	1981-82 Number	1981-82 Percent	1982-83 Number	1982-83 Percent	1983-84 Number	1983-84 Percent	1984-85 Number	1984-85 Percent
Black	2415	39	2427	39	2248	39	2204	40	2188	38
White	3797	60	3675	60	3473	60	3340	60	3482	61
Other	46	1-	53	1	21	1	23	1-	37	1
Female	4442	71	4422	72	3985	69	3836	69	3974	70
Male	1816	29	1733	28	1757	31	1731	31	1733	30
Total	6258	100.00	6155	100.00	5742	100.00	5567	100.00	5707	100.00

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 2
TOTAL CERTIFICATED STAFF

Category	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	1043	30	1001	30	983	30	961	31	983	30
White	2435	69	2273	68	2243	69	2152	69	2222	69
Other	45	1	52	2	20	1-	22	1-	30	1
Female	2487	71	2334	70	2244	69	2159	69	2276	70
Male	1036	29	992	30	1002	31	976	31	959	30
Total	3523	100.00	3326	100.00	3246	100.00	3135	100.00	3235	100.00

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 3
CERTIFICATED LEADERSHIP STAFF

Category	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	91	34	94	35	87	35	85	35	91	36
White	174	66	174	65	160	65	159	65	158	63
Other	1	1-	--	--	--	--	2	1-	2	1
Female	91	34	99	37	94	38	95	39	102	41
Male	175	66	169	63	153	62	151	61	149	59
Total	266	100.00	268	100.00	247	100.00	246	100.00	251	100.00

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 4
OTHER NON-TEACHING CERTIFICATED STAFF*

Category	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	63	25	60	26	52	27	55	27	56	28
White	184	73	169	73	143	73	145	72	144	72
Other	5	2	4	1-	1	1-	1	1-	1	1-
Female	173	69	155	67	131	67	134	67	138	69
Male	79	31	78	33	65	33	67	33	63	31
Total	252	100.00	233	100.00	196	100.00	201	100.00	201	100.00

*Includes: Counselors, Examiners, Librarians, Psychologists, School Nurses, Teacher Specialists, and Visiting Teachers.

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 5
TEACHING STAFF*

Category	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	889	30	847	30	844	30	821	31	844	30
White	2077	69	1930	68	1940	69	1848	69	1912	69
Other	39	1	48	2	19	1-	19	1-	27	1
Female	2222	74	2080	74	2019	72	1930	72	2036	73
Male	783	26	745	26	784	28	758	28	747	27
Total	3005	100.00	2825	100.00	2803	100.00	2688	100.00	2783	100.00

*Includes: Classroom Teachers, Coordinating Teachers, Teacher-Librarians, and Teachers-in-Charge.

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

Table 6

TOTAL CIVIL SERVICE STAFF

Category	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	1372	50	1426	50	1265	51	1243	51	1205	49
White	1362	50	1402	50	1230	49	1188	49	1260	51
Other	1	1-	1	1-	1	1-	1	1-	7	1-
Female	1955	71.5	2088	74	1740	70	1677	69	1698	69
Male	780	28.5	741	26	756	30	755	31	774	31
Total	2735	100.00	2829	100.00	2469	100.00	2432	100.00	2472	100.00

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

Table 7

CIVIL SERVICE LEADERSHIP STAFF

Category	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	6	17	4	13	4	11	4	11	5	12.5
White	28	80	27	84	30	86	31	86	34	85
Other	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	2.5
Female	8	23	7	22	7	20	8	22	12	30
Male	27	74	25	78	28	80	28	78	28	70
Total	35	100.00	32	100.00	35	100.00	36	100.00	40	100.00

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

Table 8

NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE STAFF

Category	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84		1984-85	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Black	1366	51	1422	51	1261	51	1239	52	1200	49
White	1334	49	1375	49	1200	49	1157	48	1226	51
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	1-
Female	1947	72	2081	74	1733	70	1669	70	1686	69
Male	753	28	716	26	728	30	727	30	746	31
Total	2700	100.00	2797	100.00	2461	100.00	2396	100.00	2432	100.00

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 9

NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION

1980 - 81

Employee Classification	Black		White		Male		Female		Totals
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Building Trades	7	19	29	81	36	100	-	-	36
Cleaning and Heating	410	71	166	29	517	90	59	10	576
Clerical - including School Clerks from Salary Schedule J	161	27	443	73	17	3	587	97	604
Food Services	276	46	323	54	3	1	596	99	599
Unclassified (excluding School Clerks)	470	63	273	37	114	15	629	85	743
Other	42	30	100	70	66	46	76	54	142
Grand Totals	1366	51	1334	49	753	28	1947	72	2700

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 10

NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION

1981 - 82

Employee Classification	Black		White		Male		Female		Totals
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Building Trades	10	25	30	75	40	100	-	-	40
Cleaning and Heating	420	73	152	27	514	90	58	10	572
Clerical - including School Clerks from Salary Schedule J	166	26	467	74	23	4	610	96	633
Food Services	302	49	311	51	9	1	604	99	613
Unclassified (excluding School Clerks)	511	60	336	40	87	90	760	10	847
Other	13	14	79	86	43	47	49	53	92
Grand Totals	1422	51	1375	49	716	26	2081	74	2797

256

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 11

NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION

1982 - 83

Employee Classification	Black		White		Male		Female		Totals
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Building Trades	14	26	39	74	52	98	1	2	53
Cleaning and Heating	386	72	153	28	487	90	52	10	539
Clerical - including School Clerks from Salary Schedule J	158	30	367	70	24	5	501	95	525
Food Services	238	48	257	52	3	1	492	99	495
Unclassified (excluding School Clerks)	424	58	308	42	81	11	651	89	732
Other	41	35	76	65	81	69	36	31	117
Grand Totals	1261	51	1200	49	728	30	1733	70	2461

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

TABLE 12

NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION

1983 - 84

Employee Classification	Black		White		Male		Female		Totals
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Building Trades	18	31	40	69	57	98	1	2	58
Cleaning and Heating	386	72	153	28	487	90	52	10	539
Clerical - including School Clerks from Salary Schedule J	139	29	356	71	24	5	471	95	495
Food Services	238	48	257	52	3	1	492	99	495
Unclassified (excluding School Clerks)	419	61	270	39	79	11	610	89	689
Other	39	32	81	68	77	64	43	36	120
Grand Totals	1239	52	1157	48	727	30	1669	70	2396

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PERSONNEL BRANCH

Table 13

NON-LEADERSHIP CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL BY POSITION CLASSIFICATION

1984-85

Employee Classification	Black		White		Other		Male		Female		Totals
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Building Trades	14	26	40	74	--	--	53	98	1	2	54
Cleaning and Heating	383	69	170	31	--	--	493	89	60	11	553
Clerical - includes School Clerks from Salary Schedule J	134	27	359	73	--	--	20	4	473	96	493
Food Services	208	49	220	51	--	--	8	2	420	98	428
Unclassified (excluding School Clerks)	428	54	353	45	6	1	91	12	696	88	787
Other	33	28	84	72	--	--	81	69	36	31	117
Grand Totals	1200	49	1226	50	6	1	746	31	1686	69	2432

APPENDIX E

Cincinnati Public Schools
DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT SERVICES

TO: Adoria Perkins, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent

FROM: Willis Holloway, Assistant Superintendent

DATE: April 30, 1985

RE: Annual Meeting of the Board Discipline Policy Committee

Pursuant to our earlier discussion, this is my official report regarding the activity of the committee which annually reviews the Board of Education's Code of Suspension, Expulsion and Removal from School. The committee met on April 29, 1985 with the following persons in attendance: Mrs. Louise Spiegel and Patricia Baker representing the Bronson Settlement Community Task Force, Mr. John Concannon of the City Solicitor's Office, Brinson Terry and Ed Spalter from my staff, along with myself.

As is customary, the committee reviewed the policy for the purpose of determining the need to recommend changes for the ensuing school year. Based upon that discussion, no recommendations are being made for change for the ensuing school year. The remainder of the meeting was spent reviewing general data related to discipline based upon questions raised by the members of the Bronson Task Force. Both Bronson Task Force members expressed grave concern about the number of suspensions in general and more specifically the disproportionate number of black students suspended in many schools.

This committee will not convene again until the spring of 1986.

WH/rsd

MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR CENTRAL DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

Goal, General Objectives, Specific Objectives and Activities	Person Responsible	Start Date	Comp. Date	Outcome Indicator(s
Goal 1.0				
- Identify an ad hoc committee that will include two representatives from the community-wide task force to review the Board of Education policy and procedures related to discipline.	Spalter	10/85	10/85	Roster of committee members
Activities				
- Solicit persons to serve on the discipline policy ad hoc review committee.	Spalter	10/85	10/85	"
- Disseminate a set of all existing policy and procedures to members of the ad hoc committee.	Spalter	10/85	10/85	Material will be sent
- Meet quarterly to review suspension-expulsion statistical data and other information related to discipline in schools (surveys, individual school plans, etc.)	Committee	11/85	6/86	Statistical data
- Establish a May meeting date and place for the ad hoc committee to carry out its deliberations.	Spalter	4/86	5/86	Meeting date will be announced
- Report to the Assistant Superintendent, Dept. of Student Services, recommended changes that eminate from the ad hoc committee.	Spalter	4/86	4/86	Report
- Prepare discipline policy and/or administrative procedure recommendations (if any) for Board consideration	Holloway	5/86	7/86	Code of Conduct Booklet
- Reproduce sufficient copies of the revised policy and/or procedures for dissemination to individual schools based upon enrollment.	Holloway	6/86	8/86	Booklet will be sent to schools

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF SUSPENSIONS   YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	SEX			RACE				AGE								GRADE						
	M	F	TOTAL	B	W	O	TOTAL	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18+	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
SENIOR																						
AIKEN	254	119	373	288	84	1	373				35	102	110	76	50				185	94	54	40
CAPE (7-12)	140	61	201	133	68	-0-	201		14	34	58	56	19	16	4		46	52	63	16	15	9
HUGHES	335	257	592	558	33	1	592			2	45	173	174	121	77				283	146	111	52
SCPA	44	23	67	37	30	-0-	67		7	15	21	6	5	10	3		17	20	11	8	2	9
TAFT	107	56	163	138	24	1	163				4	25	45	53	36					89	48	26
WALNUT HILLS	162	63	225	110	115	-0-	225		22	37	49	52	30	31	4		35	34	63	43	23	27
WESTERN HILLS	807	478	1285	681	600	4	1285		1	1	104	296	413	291	179				476	449	221	139
WITHROW	438	147	585	453	129	3	585		1	3	51	134	180	138	78				241	164	117	63
WOODWARD	472	261	733	660	73	-0-	733		1	6	71	192	234	138	91				297	205	162	69
TOTAL	2759	1465	4224	3058	1156	10	4224		46	98	438	1036	1210	874	522		98	106	1619	1214	753	434
JR. - MIDDLE																						
BLOOM	59	45	104	99	5	-0-	104		9	27	43	21	1		3		29	46	29			
CREST HILLS	63	43	106	104	2	-0-	106		11	33	39	20	3				35	71				
DATER	233	139	372	165	207	-0-	372		40	106	114	92	17	3			140	120	112			
E. HILLS (7-8)	25	4	29	11	18	-0-	29		7	10	9	3					17	12				
GAMBLE	125	72	197	117	78	2	197		16	83	62	30	5	1			83	114				
HEINOLD	83	38	121	61	60	-0-	121		4	38	47	26	6			2	61	58				
MERRY	94	59	153	149	4	-0-	153		19	51	62	21					60	93				
PEOPLES	172	60	232	108	124	-0-	232		24	60	84	60	4				91	141				
PORTER	105	54	159	62	97	-0-	159		12	39	43	54	11				72	56	31			
ROBERTS	550	385	935	82	852	1	935		80	209	280	286	64	16			351	361	223			
ROSELAWN (7-8)	19	6	25	23	2	-0-	25		3	16	6						13	12				
SAWYER	87	46	133	129	4	-0-	133		7	40	49	28	9				45	53	35			
SCHIEL (7-8)	15	11	26	19	6	1	26		4	12	9	1					6	12	8			
SCHWAB	263	114	377	228	149	-0-	377		36	136	153	47	5				149	228				
SHRODER	44	24	68	56	12	-0-	68		9	20	23	12	3	1			27	21	20			
TOTAL	1937	1100	3037	1413	1620	4	3037		281	880	1023	701	128	21	3	2	1179	1398	458			
GUILFORD	2	-0-	2	1	1	-0-	2						1		1				1		1	
McMILLAN	16	6	22	16	6	-0-	22				1	4	11	5	1			2	10	9	1	
GRAND TOTAL	4714	2571	7285	4488	2783	14	7285		327	978	1462	1741	1350	900	527	2	1277	1506	2088	1223	755	434

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF SUSPENSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	Dangerous Weapons	Disorderly Conduct	False I.D.	Fighting	Forgery	Fraud	Gambling	Improper Driving	Profanity/ Obscenity	Smoking	Theft	Trespassing	Under the Influence	Unruly Conduct	Vandalism	Alcohol/Drugs	Breaking & Entering	Explosives	Extortion	False Fire Alarm Bomb Threat	Firearms	Indictment	Physical Assault (School Emp.)	Physical Assault (student)	Robbery	Sex Offense	Starting a Fire
SENIOR																											
AIKEN	2	48	3	67	1		2	1	10	26	13	12		160	2	11							4	11			
CAPE (7-12)	2	52	1	28	5				2	6	4	5	3	79		11	1							1			1
HUGHES	5	88		114	5			1	19	2	7	1	5	319		22							4				
SCPA (7-12)		8		12	9				6		6			18	4	3											
TAFT		13		26					8	19	6			86	2	2								1			
WALNUT HILLS (7-12)	1	7	2	23	12				13	9	11		6	125		4	6							5		1	
WESTERN HILLS	3	150	15	140	27	2	6	2	23	79	9	8	3	769	8	21		2					1	16		1	
WITHROW	7	144		74	3		3	2	5	6	23	11	3	250	25	11							3	15			
WOODWARD	2	41		68	5		5		34		11	7	6	519	2	15	1	4					3	8		2	
TOTAL	22	551	21	552	67	2	16	6	120	147	90	44	26	2325	43	100	7	7					15	58		4	1
JR. - MIDDLE																											
BLOOM		43		33					7		6	3		6		1								5			
CREST HILLS	1	21		48					7		4		1	12	1	1				1				5		4	
DATER	2	14		144					40	40	4	3		116	2	3								4			
E. HILLS (7-8)		5		13					1					5	1	4											
GAMBLE		10		53					14		1	10		100	1	5							2	1			
HEINOLD	5	9		10						22	1			73	1												
MERRY	8	22		51						9	3	6		52	1									1			
PEOPLES		84		31	1				16	7	9	2	6	59	4	8								2			3
PORTER	1	22		51	1				7	18	10			48													1
ROBERTS	3	72		139					23	105	4		4	562	2	9			1				3	8			
ROSELAWN		11		10					1		3																
SAWYER	3	35		51					4	3	8			24		2								3			
SCHIEL (7-8)		3		15	3				1					4													
SCHWAB	2	99	1	90	2				12	16	17	6		106	4	10							2	7		1	2
SHRODER	6	21		23					8			1		2	2	1	1			1				2			
TOTAL	31	471	1	762	7				141	220	70	31	11	1169	19	44	1		1	2			7	38		5	6
GUILFORD														1									1				
McMILLAN		6		6					2			1			2									5			
GRAND TOTAL - SR.JR MIDDLE & SPECIAL	53	1028	22	1320	74	2	16	6	263	367	160	76	37	3495	64	144	8	7	1	2			23	101		9	7

ELEMENTARY
SUMMARY OF SUSPENSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

Pg. 1 of 2

SCHOOL	SEX			RACE				AGE									GRADE						
	M	F	TOTAL	B	W	O	TOTAL	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13+	Kdg.	1	2	3	4	5	6
ANDERSON PLACE	19	18	37	31	6	-0-	37				5	4	5	8	10	5			3	3	6	14	11
BOND HILL	8	2	10	9	1	-0-	10					1	3	1	4	1					5	3	2
BRAMBLE	27	5	32	25	7	-0-	32	2	1	1	6	10	2	7	3		3		2	7	11	6	3
BURTON	23	7	30	30	-0-	-0-	30		1		1	7	8	6	7			1	2	9	5	12	1
CAPE	13	5	18	14	4	-0-	18					1	6	2	6	3					5	3	10
CARSON	19	-0-	19	3	16	-0-	19					2	3	3	5	6				2	2	5	10
CARTHAGE	6	3	9	6	3	-0-	9		1	3	3	2					1		2	6			
CENTRAL FAIR	31	6	37	4	33	-0-	37			3	1	2	2	8	13	8		4		1	5	3	24
CHASE	160	56	216	158	58	-0-	216					20	56	54	54	32					47	84	85
CHEVIOT	7	3	10	9	1	-0-	10					2		1	5	2			1		2		7
CLIFTON	32	9	41	35	6	-0-	41			1		7	12	9	9	3		1		2	13	13	12
COLLEGE HILL	1	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-	1							1							1		
COVEDALE	6	8	14	9	5	-0-	14						1	8	2	3						7	7
DOUGLASS	20	2	22	20	2	-0-	22		1		2	3		5	7	4	1		2	1	3	3	12
EASTERN HILLS	12	3	15	13	2	-0-	15		1		1	3	5	3		2		2		8		3	2
FAIRVIEW	13	3	16	14	2	-0-	16	3	1	1	2	3	2	4			2	2	2	2	3	5	
HARTWELL	15	1	16	6	10	-0-	16		1	1		2	6	1	4	1		1	1	4	5	1	4
HAYS	25	4	29	27	2	-0-	29				3	2	2	9	5	8			4	2	10	1	12
HEBERLE	79	19	98	80	18	-0-	98			1	1	12	31	26	19	8		2	1	4	43	28	20
HEINOLD	31	24	55	26	29	-0-	55		5	1	4	3	15	19	6	2	5	1		6	7	22	14
HOFFMAN	32	15	47	47	-0-	-0-	47		1	1	5	11	10	10	3	6		1	4	5	16	15	6
HYDE PARK	3	-0-	3	2	1	-0-	3						3								3		
KILGOUR	31	10	41	29	10	2	41		1	3	2	7	6	14	5	3		4		5	10	11	11
KIRBY ROAD	14	2	16	6	10	-0-	16			1	4	7	3	1				3	7	6			
LINWOOD	68	19	87	51	33	3	87	3	6	4	9	7	9	20	24	5	8	2	10	10	13	20	24
LOSANTIVILLE	3	1	4	4	-0-	-0-	4					1	2		1					2		2	
McKINLEY	8	3	11	-0-	11	-0-	11					1		3	6	1					1	2	8
MIDWAY	4	4	8	6	2	-0-	8			3	1	1		2	1			3		2		1	2
MILLVALE	14	2	16	16	-0-	-0-	16			7	7	2						2	11	3			
MT. AIRY	6	1	7	5	2	-0-	7					2	1	1	1	2					3	3	1
MT. WASHINGTON	18	3	21	7	14	-0-	21	3	3	3	2	1		2	4	3	5	2	2	1		1	10
NORTH AVONDALE	9	4	13	13	-0-	-0-	13		1		1	1	3	5	2			1		2	4	4	2
NORTH FAIRMOUNT	25	7	32	24	8	-0-	32		5		5	7	2	4	7	2		6	5	3	5	4	9
OYLER	12	6	18	5	13	-0-	18					1	2	2	7	6		1		1	1	4	11
PARHAM	1	1	2	2	-0-	-0-	2			1			1					1			1		
PLEASANT HILL	103	32	135	119	16	-0-	135			5	24	20	34	34	15	3		2	13	24	28	34	34
PLEASANT RIDGE	41	13	54	41	13	-0-	54	2	1	1	3	12	9	10	16		2	2	3	7	10	16	14
QUEBEC HEIGHTS	20	1	21	12	9	-0-	21						1	5	7	8					1	1	19
Page Totals	959	302	1261	909	347	5	1261	13	30	41	92	167	245	288	258	127	27	44	75	128	269	331	387

ELEMENTARY
SUMMARY OF SUSPENSIONS

YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	SEX			RACE				AGE									GRADE						
	M	F	TOTAL	B	W	O	TOTAL	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13+	Kdg.	1	2	3	4	5	
ROCKDALE	34	9	43	43	-0-	-0-	43				2	3	6	14	16	2				5	4	7	27
ROLL HILL	28	12	40	38	2	-0-	40				2	7	7	11	8	5				9	5	7	19
ROOSEVELT	16	10	26	13	13	-0-	26						7	9	5	5					4	12	10
ROSELAWN	13	-0-	13	13	-0-	-0-	13			1		6		2	4			1			1	6	5
ROTHENBERG	24	7	31	29	2	-0-	31					9	5	13	2	2				4	8	14	5
SANDS MONTESSORI	12	4	16	14	2	-0-	16	2			5	4	2	3			2			3	7		4
SAYLER PARK	28	4	32	3	29	-0-	32		2	3	2		6	11	6	2		3	4			12	13
SCPA	6	14	20	15	3	2	20					3	6	7	3	1					4	9	7
SCHIEL	1	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-	1								1								1
SILVERTON	10	7	17	16	1	-0-	17					3	1	5	6	2				1	2	6	8
SOUTH AVONDALE	NONE																						
SWIFTON	1	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-	1						1								1		
TAFT	NONE																						
VINE	39	22	61	48	11	2	61		1	1	3	12	16	12	12	4		1	5	9	19	15	12
WASHBURN	35	8	43	43	-0-	-0-	43		1	3	3	5	5	12	12	2		2	3	7	7	9	15
WASHINGTON PARK	15	12	27	27	-0-	-0-	27			1	1	1	2	9	9	4				3	5	7	12
WESTWOOD	39	14	53	42	11	-0-	53			1	4	5	13	16	10	4			1	7	17	12	16
WHITTIER	68	9	77	17	60	-0-	77		2	5	1	4	12	17	30	6	4	4			17	16	36
WINDSOR	23	13	36	34	2	-0-	36			1	2	3	9	7	11	3		1	1	3	5	6	20
WINTON PLACE PRI	26	15	41	27	14	-0-	41	1	5	9	12	10	4				4	9	14	10	4		
WINTON TERR.PRIM	5	2	7	7	-0-	-0-	7		1	2	2	2						3		4			
WOODFORD PRIMARY	24	1	25	22	3	-0-	25		1	6	12	6						6	3	16			
TOTAL (this page)	447	163	610	453	153	4	610	3	13	33	51	83	102	148	131	46	6	30	35	81	110	138	210
Carried Forward	959	302	1261	909	347	5	1261	13	30	41	92	167	245	288	258	127	27	44	75	128	269	331	387
GRAND TOTAL	1406	465	1871	1362	500	9	1871	16	43	74	143	250	347	436	389	173	33	74	110	209	379	469	597

ELEMENTARY
SUMMARY OF SUSPENSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	Dangerous Weapons	Disorderly Conduct	False I.D.	Fighting	Forgery	Fraud	Gambling	Improper Driving	Profanity/ Obscenity	Smoking	Theft	Trespassing	Under the Influence	Unruly Conduct	Vandalism	Alcohol/Drugs	Breaking & Entering	Explosives	Extortion	False Fire Alarm Bomb Threat	Firearms	Indictment	Physical Assault (School Emp.)	Physical Assault (student)	Robbery	Sex Offense	Starting a Fire
ANDERSON PLACE	1	9		18							4			5													
BOND HILL		3		2										5													
BRAMBLE	1			14					2			1		12													
BURTON	2	4		21					1					2													2
CAPE	1	4		9					1		1			1		1											
CARSON		2		8					1					8													
CARTHAGE		3		4							2																
CENTRAL FAIR		17		5					2	5	1			6													
CHASE	1	50		111					1		2	1		42	6	1				1							
CHEVIOT		6		1							1			2													
CLIFTON		5		22						1	1			12													
COLLEGE HILL											1																
COVEDALE		4		3							2			5													
DOUGLASS	3	3		4							2			10													
EASTERN HILLS		5		2							1	1		4												2	
FAIRVIEW		5		1						1	4	1		4													
HARTWELL		6		2					2					6													
HAYS	2	12		6					1					8													
HEBERLE		12		41					3		1			40												1	
HEINOLD	4	6		6					1	1	2			35													
HOFFMAN	1	14	6	12					5		3	2		4													
HYDE PARK														3													
KILGOUR		17		18							1			5													
KIRBY ROAD	1	3		8										3													1
LINWOOD		6		56					1		1			21	2												
LOSANTIVILLE		3									1																
McKINLEY		4		2										5													
MIDWAY		2		3							1			1	1												
MILLVALE		3		5										7										1			
MT. AIRY				6										1													
MT. WASHINGTON		5		5					2		4			5													

ELEMENTARY
SUMMARY OF SUSPENSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	Dangerous Weapons	Disorderly Conduct	False I.D.	Fighting	Forgery	Fraud	Gambling	Improper Driving	Profanity/ Obscenity	Smoking	Theft	Trespassing	Under the Influence	Unruly Conduct	Vandalism	Alcohol/Drugs	Breaking & Entering	Explosives	Extortion	False Fire Alarm/ Bomb Threat	Firearms	Indictment	Physical Assault (School emp.)	Physical Assault (student)	Robbery	Sex Offense	Starting a Fire
NORTH AVONDALE		3		8										2													
NORTH FAIRMOUNT	1	7	3	11					1	1	1			7													
OYLER	1	5		4						2	1			5													
PARHAM									1		1																
PLEASANT HILL	4	35		25							1			70													
PLEASANT RIDGE	1	4		24					1	1				22	1												
QUEBEC HEIGHTS		14		3						1				3													
ROCKDALE		8		30										5													
ROLL HILL		2		31				2		1	1			3													
ROOSEVELT		7		10						3				6													
ROSELAWN		4		7					1		1																
ROTHENBERG		5		15					1			1		9													
SANDS		3		6										7													
SAYLER PARK		5		25					1		1																
SCPA		3		5					1		4			7													
SILVERTON				11							1			5													
SOUTH AVONDALE	NONE																										
SWIFTON		1																									
TAFT	NONE																										
VINE	1	10		37					2		10												1				
WASHBURN	1	5		12					3		1			19	1												1
WASHINGTON PARK		6		13										7									1				
WESTWOOD		6		30					1		3			13													
WHITTIER		18		35					3		4			17													
WINDSOR	1	2		27					2					3													1
WINTON PLACE PRIM	1	11		22										7													
WINTON TERR. PRIM	1	2		3										1													
WOODFORD PRIMARY		7		9					3					6													
SCHIEL		1																									
GRAND TOTALS	29	387	9	798				2	44	17	66	7		486	11	2				2			2	1		3	5

1

SUMMARY OF EXPULSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	SEX			RACE				AGE								GRADE					
	M	F	TOTAL	B	W	O	TOTAL	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18+	7	8	9	10	11	12
SENIOR																					
AIKEN	19	8	27	18	9	-0-	27				4	7	5	8	3			12	8	4	3
CAPE (7-12)	8	9	17	8	9	-0-	17			2	6	5	1	3			5	7	2	2	1
HUGHES	18	12	30	28	2	-0-	30				2	5	10	9	4			11	12	5	2
SCPA	1	4	5	-0-	5	-0-	5			1	1		1	2			1	1	1	1	1
TAFT	3	1	4	3	1	-0-	4						1	2	1				1	2	1
WALNUT HILLS	10	2	12	4	8	-0-	12			1		7	1	2	1			5	4		3
WESTERN HILLS	40	11	51	32	19	-0-	51				4	15	13	13	6			18	23	9	1
WITHROW	31	6	37	30	7	-0-	37				1	6	11	9	10			10	17	8	2
WOODWARD	30	7	37	36	1	-0-	37				3	11	12	8	3			17	11	6	3
TOTAL	160	60	220	159	61	-0-	220			4	21	56	55	56	28		6	81	79	37	17
JR. - MIDDLE																					
BLOOM	14	9	23	23	-0-	-0-	23		2	5	11	4	1			8	7	8			
CREST HILLS	8	1	9	9	-0-	-0-	9			3	2	4				2	7				
DATER	4	4	8	2	6	-0-	8			1	2	3	2			1	3	4			
E. HILLS (7-8)	4	-0-	4	-0-	4	-0-	4			3	1					3	1				
GAMBLE	9	3	12	6	6	-0-	12			5	4	2	1			5	7				
HEINOLD	1	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-	1			1						1					
MERRY	2	1	3	3	-0-	-0-	3				2		1				3				
PEOPLES	10	4	14	6	8	-0-	14			3	7	4				4	10				
PORTER	-0-	3	3	-0-	3	-0-	3				3					1	1	1			
ROBERTS	17	6	23	6	17	-0-	23		1	2	4	9	6	1		5	5	13			
ROSELAWN (7-8)	NONE																				
SAWYER	5	-0-	5	5	-0-	-0-	5					2	3				2	3			
SCHIEL (7-8)	NONE																				
SCHWAB	22	7	29	17	12	-0-	29			9	11	9				9	20				
SHRODER	5	1	6	6	-0-	-0-	6		1	1	3	1				1	4	1			
TOTAL	101	39	140	84	56	-0-	140		4	33	50	38	14	1		40	70	30			
GUILFORD	NONE																				
McMILLAN	4	2	6	5	1	-0-	6			1		2	2	1			1	3	1	1	
TOTAL SR., JR., MIDDLE & SPECIAL EXPULSIONS	265	101	366	248	118	-0-	366		4	38	71	96	71	58	28	40	77	114	80	38	17

SUMMARY OF EXPULSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	Dangerous Weapons	Disorderly Conduct	False I.D.	Fighting	Forgery	Fraud	Gambling	Improper Driving	Profanity/ Obscenity	Smoking	Theft	Trespassing	Under the Influence	Unruly Conduct	Vandalism	Alcohol/Drugs	Breaking & Entering	Explosives	Extortion	False Fire Alarm Bomb Threat	Firearms	Indictment	Physical Assault (School Emp.)	Physical Assault (student)	Robbery	Sex Offense	Starting a Fire
SENIOR																											
AIKEN	2	1		2												8							3	11			
CAPE (7-12)		1											3			11								1			1
HUGHES		3												1		22							4				
SCPA (7-12)																3								2			
TAFT		1														2								1			
WALNUT HILLS (7-12)																6	3							2		1	
WESTERN HILLS		6		1							3			6		21								13		1	
WITHROW	3	2		1							6	1		3		9							1	11			
WOODWARD											6					14	1	4					3	7		2	
TOTAL	5	14		4							15	1	3	10		96	4	4					11	48		4	1
JR. - MIDDLE																											
BLOOM		4		14							1					2								2			
CREST HILLS											1					2								4		2	
DATER				1												4								3			
E. HILLS (7-8)																4											
GAMBLE		3												1		5							2	1			
HEINOLD		1																									
MERRY	1			1																				1			
PEOPLES		1														8								2			3
PORTER				2																							1
ROBERTS		3									1			1		8			1				1	8			
ROSELAWN	NONE																										
SAWYER																2								3			
SCHIEL (7-8)	NONE																										
SCHWAB	1	6									1				3	8							2	5		1	2
SHRODER															1	1	1				1		1	1			
TOTAL	2	18		18							4			2	4	44	1		1		1		6	30		3	6
TOTAL SR., JR. & MIDDLE SCHOOLS	7	32		22							19	1	3	12	4	140	5	4	1		1		17	78		7	7
GUILFORD	NONE																										
McMILLAN CENTER		1																						5			

ELEMENTARY
SUMMARY OF EXPULSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

Page 1 of 2

9

SCHOOL	SEX			RACE				AGE									GRADE						
	M	F	TOTAL	B	W	O	TOTAL	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13+	Kdg.	1	2	3	4	5	6
ANDERSON PLACE																							
BOND HILL																							
BRAMBLE																							
BURTON																							
CAPE	-0-	1	1	1	-0-	-0-	1								1								1
CARSON																							
CARTHAGE																							
CENTRAL FAIR	1	-0-	1	-0-	1	-0-	1						1								1		
CHASE	4	1	5	2	3	-0-	5					1	2	1		1					1	1	3
CHEVIOT																							
CLIFTON																							
COLLEGE HILL																							
COVEDALE																							
DOUGLASS																							
EASTERN HILLS																							
FAIRVIEW																							
HARTWELL																							
HAYS																							
HEBERLE																							
HEINOLD	-0-	1	1	-0-	1	-0-	1							1									1
HOFFMAN																							
HYDE PARK																							
KILGOUR																							
KIRBY ROAD	1	-0-	1	-0-	1	-0-	1				1								1				
LINWOOD																							
LOSANTIVILLE																							
McKINLEY																							
MIDWAY																							
MILLVALE																							
MT. AIRY																							
MT. WASHINGTON																							
NORTH AVONDALE																							
NORTH FAIRMOUNT																							
OYLER	1	-0-	1	-0-	1	-0-	1								1								1
PARHAM																							
PLEASANT HILL																							
PLEASANT RIDGE																							
QUEBEC HEIGHTS																							
PAGE TOTALS	7	3	10	4	6	-0-	10				1	1	3	2	2	1			1		2	1	6

ELEMENTARY
SUMMARY OF EXPULSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

Page 2 of 2

SCHOOL	SEX			RACE				AGE									GRADE						
	M	F	TOTAL	B	W	O	TOTAL	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13+	Kdg.	1	2	3	4	5	6
ROCKDALE																							
ROLL HILL																							
ROOSEVELT																							
ROSELAWN																							
ROTHENBERG																							
SANDS MONTESSORI																							
SAYLER PARK																							
SCPA																							
SCHIEL																							
SILVERTON																							
SOUTH AVONDALE																							
SWIFTON																							
TAFT																							
VINE	1	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-	1					1									1		
WASHBURN	1	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-	1								1								1
WASHINGTON PARK	1	-0-	1	1	-0-	-0-	1									1							1
WESTWOOD																							
WHITTIER																							
WINDSOR																							
WINTON PLACE PRI																							
WINTON TERR.PRIM																							
WOODFORD PRIMARY																							
TOTAL (this page)	3	-0-	3	3	-0-	-0-	3					1			1	1					1		2
Carried Forward	7	3	10	4	6	-0-	10				1	1	3	2	2	1			1		2	1	6
GRAND TOTAL	10	3	13	7	6	-0-	13				1	2	3	2	3	2			1		3	1	8

SUMMARY OF ELEMENTARY EXPULSIONS YEARLY TOTALS 1984-1985

SCHOOL	Dangerous Weapons	Disorderly Conduct	False I.D.	Fighting	Forgery	Fraud	Gambling	Improper Driving	Profanity/ Obscenity	Smoking	Theft	Trespassing	Under the Influence	Unruly Conduct	Vandalism	Alcohol/Drugs	Breaking & Entering	Explosives	Extortion	False Fire Alarm/ Bomb Threat	Firearms	Indictment	Physical Assault (School emp.)	Physical Assault (student)	Robbery	Sex Offense	Starting a Fire
CAPE																1											
CENTRAL FAIRMOUNT																				1							
CHASE															3	1				1							
HEINOLD														1													
KIRBY ROAD																											1
OYLER	1																										
WASHBURN																											1
WASHINGTON PARK																							1				
VINE																							1				
TOTALS	1													1	3	2				2			2				2

EXHIBIT A

APPENDIX E

BIAS STUDIES

The Nature of Bias in Achievement Tests

For many years there has been concern that standardized tests may be biased against various ethnic, cultural, and economic groups in this country. In recent years criticism to that effect apparently has increased and certainly has become more vocal. Most of the criticism has been directed toward aptitude and intelligence tests. Some critics have said that aptitude test scores reflect opportunity and education rather than aptitude and that aptitude tests are actually achievement tests. Although some specialists in educational measurement believe that charges of bias do not apply to achievement tests,[12-13] others believe that achievement tests are as biased as aptitude tests because of the many cultural differences within our society.[14] An extended discussion of these issues can be found in Wargo and Green, 1978.[15]

In 1971, Green established that some bias against a number of minority groups, albeit an apparently small amount, occurs as a function of the typical item selection procedures used in constructing major achievement tests.[16] As a result, CTB/McGraw-Hill used a modified set of item selection procedures in the development of *The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form S* (CTBS/S), published in 1973. The data from that effort indicate that the new procedures were useful in reducing bias[17]; accordingly, similar procedures were adopted for CAT C and D.

An achievement test is biased when it systematically produces unfair scores for a particular group, a result that can occur only if the test measures something somewhat different for that group than for others.[18] For example, a reading comprehension test might function largely as a measure of the vocabulary for one ethnic group (for example black students) because of the large differences within the group in their knowledge of the words in the reading passages. In another ethnic group, almost all students might know most of the words. For the second group, the test would mainly be a measure of comprehension, as intended. Differences in scores would be erroneously attributed to differences in reading comprehension skills in the first instance but correctly so in the second. The test is therefore biased.

Similarly, assume that two groups, A and B, are known to read with equal understanding when content and vocabulary are equally familiar to both of them. If a reading comprehension test is administered that has more words that are unfamiliar to Group A than to Group B, the students in Group A will consistently achieve lower scores on the test. This would lead to the faulty conclusion that Group A students have poorer reading comprehension skills. This test is also a biased test. Differential variation in students' familiarity with the content of a reading passage can have the same effect.

---

[12] Robert L. Ebel, "Constructing Unbiased Achievement Tests." Paper presented at the NIE Conference for Test Bias, Washington, D.C., December 1975.

[13] George Weber, "Uses and Abuses of Standardized Testing in the Schools," *Occasional Paper No. 22* (Council for Basic Education, 1974).

[14] Robert L. Williams, "Black Pride, Academic Relevance and Individual Achievement," *The Counseling Psychologist* Vol. 2, 1970, pp. 18-22.

[15] Michael J. Wargo and Donald Ross Green (eds.), *Achievement Testing of Minority and Disadvantaged Students for Educational Program Evaluation* (Monterey, Calif.: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1978).

[16] Donald Ross Green, "Racial and Ethnic Bias in Achievement Test Construction" (Monterey, Calif.: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1972).

[17] *Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Forms S and T, Technical Bulletin No. 2* (Monterey, Calif.: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1977).

[18] Donald Ross Green, "What Does It Mean To Say a Test is Biased?" *Education and Urban Society* Vol. 8, 1975, pp. 35-51.

Sources of Bias

There are two possible sources of bias in tests. The first can be found in the language and thought patterns of test authors and editors. In developing a reading comprehension test, for example, the authors and editors would probably tend to use words and expressions that are commonly used by members of the group to which they belong. However, words and phrases that are common usage among the authors and editors of the test may not be common usage among the members of a particular ethnic, cultural, or economic group. Beyond language usage and vocabulary, tests can also reflect attitudes, values, and information that may not in fact be part of what the test is intended to measure. If the attitudes and values implicit in a test are similar to those of students who take the test, the students' performance is probably helped, whereas students with dissimilar attitudes and values may not perform as well. Likewise, some test items may be put in a context that is less familiar to one group than to another, in which case the items are likely to be more difficult for students in the former group, even though these aspects of the items are not part of what the test is meant to measure.

A second source of bias may be the procedures used to try out test materials. The products of even the most skillful test writers and editors do not always work well, and no serious test publisher would produce a standardized test without extensive trials of the materials. Tryouts provide data for identifying stimulus materials and test items that should be revised or discarded and for selecting the best materials and items from among those tried out.

The characteristics of the tryout group can influence the apparent effectiveness of the test items. The items that appear to be most effective are likely to be the ones that are most suitable to the majority of the tryout group in terms of language, implicit or explicit values, and so on. These items will probably be chosen for the final version of the test. The result may be a test that tends to yield unfair scores for students who differ from the majority in the tryout group. The bias resulting from tryout procedures may build on and accentuate any bias inherent in the stimulus materials or test items.

Procedures for Reducing Bias in CAT C and D

In the development of CAT C and D, efforts were made to reduce any discernible bias stemming from the sources described previously. Procedures intended to accomplish this were specified to be used in test construction, and research was conducted to evaluate the results.

Test Construction and Review Procedures

The first and perhaps most important step toward minimizing bias in a test is to write and edit the content carefully. If the writers and editors are sensitive to variations in the background and culture of those for whom the test is intended, fewer potentially biased items will be produced. To that end, guidelines for avoiding bias in test development were specified. Test writers were instructed to consider the background and viewpoints of disadvantaged students, especially those from black and Spanish-speaking families, and then to avoid writing any material not necessary to the purpose of the items that might bias the outcomes. The writers were also instructed to develop material that would represent a variety of ethnic and cultural interests. These guidelines were also emphasized during the editing phase. (See "Test Development" in Part 2.)

After the tests were written and edited, they were reviewed by representatives of various ethnic and cultural groups, including a number of black and Spanish-speaking reviewers from different parts of the country. Among the reviewers were teachers, content and curriculum experts, and specialists in the education of minority students. Comments of the reviewers were carefully considered in selecting and revising the materials to be included in the Standardization Edition of CAT C and D. Such a review procedure is particularly effective in detecting racism, stereotyping, and other expressions of inappropriate attitudes. Although these phenomena are probably not the most common causes of biased results, they are nevertheless undesirable.

Analysis of Item Data

To provide data for item selection and/or revision, item tryouts were conducted. The basic procedures used are described in Part 2. In order to avoid accentuating any residual ethnic bias in the items, the additional step used for CTBS/S was again added to the customary item selection procedures; that is, item data for black students were examined separately.

The students in the tryouts were asked to identify themselves as Black, Spanish-speaking, or Other. (In the primary grades, teachers were asked to provide the students' ethnic identification.) In addition, the regular tryout sample was augmented beyond the number otherwise needed with schools having predominately black enrollment. These additional cases were in the upper two grades for each level. In general, it proved possible to find largely black schools that were willing to cooperate. Nevertheless, here and there among the 100 tryout books the number of black cases was thin, apparently because the students did not provide ethnic identification on the answer sheet as requested. Substantially less success was achieved in the effort to get a sample of Hispanic students large enough to analyze. Only at Level 16 was a reasonable number of Hispanic students obtained. Therefore, the Hispanic data were not used for screening purposes.

The number of tryout cases with ethnic identification in each grade for each level is shown in Table 115. In many instances no identification was given; these individuals were not included in the bias analyses. The numbers in Table 115 are totals; it should be understood that there were ten tryout books at each level so that the number of cases obtained for any one item was considerably less. Table 116 shows the numbers obtained for each tryout book at Levels 12, 15, and 18. These cases were distributed over the grades at which the level was tried so that the number of blacks at any one grade was sometimes small. This is illustrated by Table 117, which shows the number of cases per tryout book by grade for Level 15.

All tryout items went through two screenings. One used the standard tryout data, which included all individuals in the schools sampled. In the second screening, data for the black students were examined separately and were compared with the data for students identified as Other. The items which appeared biased or unsatisfactory for blacks were identified. The editors then used this information along with that from the standard analyses in constructing the final test. Because content validity was the primary consideration, some items were included which appeared to be unsatisfactory or biased on the basis of the tryout data; whenever possible such items were revised in an effort to reduce the possible bias. For example, if a particular distractor appeared responsible for the item bias, then that distractor was revised.

The item statistics used as indicators of bias were principally (1) the point biserial correlation, which shows the relation of items to category objective scores, and (2) grade-to-grade growth as shown by item difficulties. The point biserials for each of the separate ethnic groups were calculated from the data for all students who took the item, regardless of grade. In comparing grade-to-grade growth, the upper two grades at any test level were given primary consideration. Point biserials under .20 were considered unsatisfactory for either the "Black" or "Other" group, and differences between the groups in excess of .20 were considered evidence of bias.

With respect to growth, gains of less than .05 were considered unsatisfactory, and differences in growth greater than .20 were taken as evidence of bias. It should be noted that the analyses focused on differences in growth between the Black and Other groups rather than on differences in difficulty per se. The latter sort of differences were generally not considered except in those few cases when there was an excess of items that proved satisfactory on all other counts.

In most instances the point biserial was given more weight than the growth statistic in labeling an item as biased. This procedure was followed partly because there was no reasonable way to adjust the obtained difficulties for the separate ethnic groups as was done for the standard sample (see "Item Tryout and Selection" in Part 2) and partly because the cases at succeeding grade levels were not always from the same schools. These two factors caused the meaning of the relative size of the growth statistic to be open to question.

Following analysis of the tryout data, some items were dropped, some were revised, and some were shifted to other levels. Many objectives were limited to fewer levels than in the tryouts. Thus, the data on the final instrument will not be directly comparable to the tryout data, and the tryout data for most objectives and tests do not represent the characteristics of the published instrument. Consequently, rather than display all the tryout data for all levels and all objectives, data and examples from Levels 12, 15, and 18 are presented here to illustrate the effect of the item selection procedures on bias in CAT C and D.

Level 12 Tryout Data

The Level 12 tryout booklets were administered in Grades 2 and 3. To obtain growth comparisons, the data for Grades 2 and 3 were used separately, but the data for the two grades were combined to determine the point biserials for each item. Table 118 indicates the number of items tried out in each subject area at Level 12, the number of items judged to be biased, and what was done with them. For example, of the 149 Mathematics Concepts and Applications items tried out, thirty-seven were classified as biased; eighteen of these were unsatisfactory in one way or another for the standard group as well and were rejected. Of the nineteen remaining, sixteen were rejected solely because they were biased, and three were used. It should be noted that one item with unsatisfactory standard data was also used. In these four cases, content considerations overrode the tryout data.

Table 119 shows the distributions of point biserials and the growth statistic ΔP (per cent correct at upper grade minus per cent correct at lower grade for these mathematics items. Also shown are the median values and the percentages of items failing to meet the standard of discriminations for growth irrespective of bias. Clearly the items selected are better on the average than those rejected, but it is worth noting again that these item statistics were not the sole criteria for selection.

These data for Level 12 mathematics items represent six objectives, one of which (Geometry) was subsequently not included at this level. In the category objective Number Sentences, seven of the twenty items tried out were used. Table 120 shows the distribution for these items. Of the five that were labeled biased, one was used. This one item was in fact not necessarily biased but, rather, very difficult for the black group, having "p" values of .19 and .33 for the black samples in Grades 2 and 3 respectively. The difficulty of the item undoubtedly accounted, at least in part, for its low point biserial of .18 (the point biserial was .23 for the 138 third-grade blacks). The .26 point biserial for the standard group was not very much better. The item was chosen because it was the best available to fit the content specifications for the objective. The result of the separate analyses of the data for black students was a reduction in the number of items biased against blacks, although apparently some bias—presumably small—remains.

Level 15 Tryout Data

The Level 15 tryout books were administered in Grades 4, 5, and 6. The growth data were based on Grades 5 and 6, but all three grades were combined to obtain the point biserials. The number of biased items among those tried out at Level 15 was greater than that at Level 12 for most tests, as shown in Table 121. In Reading Vocabulary forty-eight of 160 items were labeled biased, and fourteen of them were used. The bias data contributed to the rejection of sixteen items that met all other statistical criteria, and the remaining eighteen unused items failed to meet both the bias criteria and other statistical criteria.

Table 122 shows the distributions of point biserials and Δp's for the Reading Vocabulary items. There were four category objectives for Reading Vocabulary at Level 15. One of these objectives—Synonyms, with sixty-nine of the 160 tryout items—accounted for thirteen of the fourteen biased Reading Vocabulary items that were used at Level 15 in the Standardization Edition. Table 123 shows the distributions of the two statistics for the Synonyms objective. This objective provides an example of a set of items which was probably slightly biased as a whole, as evidenced by the fact that all but four of the sixty-nine Synonyms items had lower point biserials for the black than for the standard group. Twenty-six of the items were labeled biased; half of these were used and half were rejected. Ten of those used were revised. For example, the following item on synonyms had a point biserial of −.16 for the black group but +.35 for the standard group:

proper amount

A same   B least   C fitting   D smallest

The average performance of the black samples at all three grade levels was below chance; consequently the item was labeled biased. When the item was examined by the editors, two ways of improving the item were identified. One was to change the answer from "fitting" to the more common adjective "correct." The other was to change "smallest" to "remarkable," a distractor less similar to "least." These changes put the item more in conformance with the general editorial standards used in the test. Furthermore, it is reasonable to hypothesize here that these changes will prove to have reduced or eliminated the bias.

Level 18 Tryout Data

The number of biased items identified at Level 18 can be found in Table 124. The Level 18 books were tried out at Grades 7, 8, and 9. The data for the reading items are not included because the number of cases of blacks taking these books was judged to be too small to yield meaningful information. As at the other levels, there was considerable variation among the content areas and objectives in the amount of bias detected. In Language Mechanics, for example, only thirteen of 120 items were judged biased, and none of them were used. The distribution of the two statistics (Table 125) shows that three of the items selected had point biserials which were not quite satisfactory for blacks, while two showed little growth in that group. However, many items that were rated poor for blacks were rejected. The data for Objective 52, End Marks/Colon/Semicolon, is presented in Table 126. Four of these twenty items were judged biased, and none of the four were used. In fact, all thirteen items chosen (two of them were used at Level 17) had fully satisfactory statistics for both groups. Again it seems logical to conclude that the resulting tests are less biased than they would have been if separate analyses for blacks had not been done.

As a result of the item selection procedures described above, CAT C and D was probably somewhat improved for Hispanic as well as black students. Three of the language books at Level 16 were taken by a sufficient number of Hispanic students to permit bias analyses. In these three books eighty items were labeled biased against the black students and seventy-three biased against the Hispanic students. Forty-six of these items were biased against both groups. Thus 63% of the items that were biased against Hispanics already had been identified as biased from the black data. These common items were concentrated in certain objectives, such as Objective 57, Pronouns. In other objectives, such as the identification of complete, incomplete, and run-on sentences, the biased items were not the same for the two groups. The nature of these relationships and the validity of the various inferences made from the tryout data will be evaluated in Technical Bulletin 2 using the standardization data.

Table 115

NUMBER OF CASES WITH ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION
IN THE CAT C AND D TRYOUT BY GRADE, LEVEL, AND ETHNIC GROUP

GRADE	LEVEL 11		LEVEL 12			LEVEL 13		LEVEL 14		LEVEL 15		LEVEL 16			LEVEL 17		LEVEL 18		LEVEL 19		LEVEL 20	
	Blk	Oth	Blk	Hsp	Oth	Blk	Oth	Blk	Oth	Blk	Oth	Blk	Hsp	Oth	Blk	Oth	Blk	Oth	Blk	Oth	Blk	Oth
1	872	2625																				
2	958	3008	879	135	2671	495	2920															
3			739	205	2653	955	3864	257	3253													
4						615	3339	712	2744	432	3037											
5								847	2951	987	4582	933		3482								
6										790	2299	545	355	3296	745	3600						
7												848	359	2913	1122	4223	192	4027				
8															313	1993	960	2299	336	2429		
9																	516	3788	604	3215		
10																			572	2209	527	2874
11																			633	2813	562	2963
12																					549	2149
TOTAL	1730	5834	1578	340	5324	2065	10123	1816	8948	2209	9918	2326	714	9691	2180	9816	1668	10114	2145	10666	1638	7986

Table 116

NUMBER OF CASES WITH ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION PER TRYOUT BOOK FOR LEVELS 12, 15, AND 18 OF CAT C AND D

TRYOUT BOOK	LEVEL 12, GRADES 2,3		LEVEL 15, GRADES 4, 5, 6		LEVEL 18, GRADES 7, 8, 9	
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Other
Reading Book 1	266	366	147	665	65	641
Reading Book 2	159	311	186	787	63	664
Reading Book 3	139	331	216	891	95	1037
Reading Book 4	130	637	316	935	103	1002
Math Book 1	277	749	266	983	271	1064
Math Book 2	139	494	312	1498	203	981
Math Book 3*	109	720	421	1257	366	814
Spelling Book 1*	85	637	421	743	366	814
Language Book 1	276	393	149	1152	270	937
Language Book 2	85	637	121	957	105	1455
Language Book 3	98	686	75	794	127	1519

*Spelling actually appeared in Math Book 3. However, since some students did not take the spelling section, it is designated separately here.

Table 117

NUMBER OF CASES WITH ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION PER TRYOUT BOOK BY GRADE AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 15 OF CAT C AND D

TRYOUT BOOK	GRADE 4		GRADE 5		GRADE 6	
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Other
Reading Book 1	52	300	66	185	29	180
Reading Book 2	30	346	104	308	52	133
Reading Book 3	56	350	91	312	69	229
Reading Book 4	99	219	70	396	147	320
Math Book 1	1	313	120	481	145	189
Math Book 2	3	480	139	732	170	286
Math Book 3	60	301	239	736	122	220
Spelling Book 1	60	166	239	357	122	220
Language Book 1	28	212	118	572	3	368
Language Book 2	68	309	28	502	25	146
Language Book 3	35	208	12	358	28	228

Table 118

SUMMARY OF BIASED TRYOUT ITEMS BY SUBJECT AREA FOR LEVEL 12 OF CAT C AND D

SUBJECT AREA	NUMBER OF ITEMS	BIASED ITEMS		BIASED ITEMS USED		BIASED ITEMS REJECTED			
						With Biased Item Data the Only Statistical Grounds for Rejection		With Biased Item Data and Other Statistical Grounds for Rejection	
		N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Phonic Analysis	180	12	7	0	0	5	3	7	4
Structural Analysis	89	14	16	1	1	7	8	6	7
Reading Vocabulary	60	5	8	1	2	2	3	2	3
Reading Comprehension	120	23	19	3	3	10	8	10	8
Spelling	80	10	13	0	0	2	3	8	10
Language Mechanics	120	12	10	0	0	5	4	7	6
Language Expression*									
Mathematics Computation	88	22	25	2	2	2	2	18	20
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	149	37	25	3	2	16	11	18	12
TOTAL	886	135	15	10	1	49	6	76	9

*Because of content considerations concerning the measurement of standard English, the items for four of the five category objectives in Language Expression at Level 12 were not analyzed for bias. Therefore, no data are presented.

Table 119

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) AND POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR TRYOUT ITEMS USED AND NOT USED BY ETHNIC GROUP IN THE MATH CONCEPTS AND APPLICATIONS TEST OF LEVEL 12 OF CAT C AND D

ΔP INTERVALS	ΔP DISTRIBUTIONS			
	Items Used		Items Not Used	
	Black	Other	Black	Other
.45—.49			1	1
.40—.44		1	1	2
.35—.39	2	1	2	5
.30—.34	7	2	3	2
.25—.29	2	3	7	9
.20—.24	5	8	9	12
.15—.19	9	13	12	8
.10—.14	8	3	17	14
.05—.09	5	8	23	15
.00—.04	1		15	28
-.01—-.04		1	13	11
-.05—-.09	1		4	2
-.10—-.14			2	
MEDIAN	.17	.18	.09	.09
PER CENT WITH ΔP< .05	5%	3%	31%	38%

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	POINT BISERIAL DISTRIBUTIONS			
	Items Used		Items Not Used	
	Black	Other	Black	Other
.60—.64				3
.55—.59		2		5
.50—.54	3	3	2	6
.45—.49		11	5	8
.40—.44	3	8	8	11
.35—.39	9	9	11	19
.30—.34	11	5	14	9
.25—.29	3	1	20	15
.20—.24	5		5	5
.15—.19	4	1	15	7
.10—.14	1		15	12
.05—.09	1		3	3
.00—.04			5	6
-.01—-.04			3	
-.05—-.09			2	
-.10—-.14			1	
MEDIAN	.32	.42	.26	.33
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	13%	3%	40%	26%

Table 120

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) AND POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR TRYOUT ITEMS USED AND NOT USED BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR THE "NUMBER SENTENCES" CATEGORY OBJECTIVE OF LEVEL 12 OF CAT C AND D

ΔP INTERVALS	ΔP DISTRIBUTIONS Items Used Black	Items Used Other	Items Not Used Black	Items Not Used Other
.35—.39	1			
.30—.34	1			
.25—.29	1		1	
.20—.24		2	2	2
.15—.19	1	3	2	2
.10—.14	3	1	2	3
.05—.09		1	4	5
.00—.04			1	1
−.01—−.04			1	
MEDIAN	.17	.17	.12	.11
PER CENT WITH ΔP < .05	0%	0%	15%	8%

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	POINT BISERIAL DISTRIBUTIONS Items Used Black	Items Used Other	Items Not Used Black	Items Not Used Other
.55—.59		1		
.50—.54	1			1
.45—.49		2		
.40—.44		1		1
.35—.39	2	1	2	5
.30—.34	1	1	3	2
.25—.29	1	1	3	2
.20—.24	1			1
.15—.19	1		4	1
.10—.14				
.05—.09				
.00—.04				
−.01—−.04				
−.05—−.09			1	
MEDIAN	.32	.42	.28	.36
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	14%	0%	38%	8%

Table 121

SUMMARY OF BIASED TRYOUT ITEMS BY SUBJECT AREA FOR LEVEL 15 OF CAT C AND D

SUBJECT AREA	NUMBER OF ITEMS	BIASED ITEMS		BIASED ITEMS USED		BIASED ITEMS REJECTED: With Biased Item Data the Only Statistical Grounds for Rejection		BIASED ITEMS REJECTED: With Biased Item Data and Other Statistical Grounds for Rejection	
		N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Reading Vocabulary	160	48	30	14	9	16	10	18	11
Reading Comprehension	200	75	38	26	13	23	12	26	13
Spelling	80	20	25	10	13	0	0	10	13
Language Mechanics	120	5	4	0	0	1	1	4	3
Language Expression	240	30	13	11	5	0	0	19	8
Mathematics Computation	160	35	22	2	1	2	1	31	19
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	198	59	30	7	4	3	2	49	25
TOTAL	1158	332	29	70	6	45	4	157	14

Table 122

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) AND POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR TRYOUT ITEMS USED AND NOT USED BY ETHNIC GROUP IN THE READING VOCABULARY TEST OF LEVEL 15 OF CAT C AND D

ΔP INTERVALS	ΔP DISTRIBUTIONS Items Used Black	 Other	 Items Not Used Black	 Other
.30—.34	1			
.25—.29	1		1	
.20—.24	3	3	3	7
.15—.19	3	10	8	19
.10—.14	5	33	14	39
.05—.09	13	10	17	22
.00—.04	17	1	24	14
−.01—−.04	6		13	2
−.05—−.09	6		16	
−.10—−.14	2		7	
MEDIAN	.04	.12	.03	.11
PER CENT WITH $\Delta P < .05$	54%	2%	58%	16%

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	POINT BISERIAL DISTRIBUTIONS Items Used Black	 Other	 Items Not Used Black	 Other
.70—.74				
.65—.69		3		
.60—.64	2	9		10
.55—.59	1	13	1	24
.50—.54	6	7	7	18
.45—.49	8	10	16	14
.40—.44	4	7	14	7
.35—.39	7	5	11	7
.30—.34	8	1	13	8
.25—.29	6	1	11	6
.20—.24	4	1	8	2
.15—.19	6		5	1
.10—.14	1		5	3
.05—.09	3		5	1
.00—.04			2	1
−.01—−.04			1	
−.05—−.09			2	1
−.10—−.14			1	
−.15—−.19	1		1	
MEDIAN	.35	.52	.30	.51
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	19%	0%	21%	7%

Table 123

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) AND POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR TRYOUT ITEMS USED AND NOT USED BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR THE "SYNONYMS" CATEGORY OBJECTIVE OF LEVEL 15 OF CAT C AND D

ΔP INTERVALS	ΔP DISTRIBUTIONS				POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	POINT BISERIAL DISTRIBUTIONS			
	Items Used		Items Not Used			Items Used		Items Not Used	
	Black	Other	Black	Other		Black	Other	Black	Other
.30—.34	1				.60—.64		4		1
.25—.29	1				.55—.59		6	1	5
.20—.24	2	1	1		.50—.54	2	6	1	4
.15—.19	2	4	6		.45—.49	4	8	5	6
.10—.14	2	22	5	13	.40—.44	3	6	2	1
.05—.09	10	9	4	13	.35—.39	4	5	3	4
.00—.04	12	1	3	6	.30—.34	6		3	6
−.01—−.04			2		.25—.29	5	1	3	3
−.05—−.09	5		6		.20—.24	2	1	3	
−.10—−.14	2		5		.15—.19	6		2	
					.10—.14	1		4	1
					.05—.09	3		3	
					.00—.04			1	1
					−.01—−.04				
					−.05—−.09				
					−.10—−.14			1	
					−.15—−.19	1			
MEDIAN	.04	.12	.04	.08	MEDIAN	.30	.48	.29	.47
PER CENT WITH $\Delta P < .05$	51%	3%	50%	19%	PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	27%	0%	34%	6%

Table 124

SUMMARY OF BIASED TRYOUT ITEMS BY SUBJECT AREA FOR LEVEL 18 OF CAT C AND D

SUBJECT AREA	NUMBER OF ITEMS	BIASED ITEMS		BIASED ITEMS USED		BIASED ITEMS REJECTED			
						With Biased Item Data the Only Statistical Grounds for Rejection		With Biased Item Data and Other Statistical Grounds for Rejection	
		N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Reading Vocabulary*									
Reading Comprehension*									
Spelling	80	23	29	1	1	5	6	17	21
Language Mechanics	120	13	11	0	0	1	1	12	10
Language Expression	100	34	34	15	15	2	2	17	17
Mathematics Computation	160	13	8	1	1	5	3	7	4
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	161	27	17	6	4	7	4	14	9
TOTAL	621	110	18	23	4	20	3	67	11

***Data is not available for these items because of a small black sample at Grades 7, 8, and 9.**

Table 125

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) AND POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR TRYOUT ITEMS USED AND NOT USED BY ETHNIC GROUP IN THE LANGUAGE MECHANICS TEST OF LEVEL 18 OF CAT C AND D

ΔP INTERVALS	ΔP DISTRIBUTIONS			
	Items Used		Items Not Used	
	Black	Other	Black	Other
.40— 44	1	1	5	3
.35—.39	8	5	5	2
.30— 34	11	3	3	2
.25—.29	8	11	8	11
.20— 24	10	7	12	10
.15—.19	6	13	9	17
.10—.14	3	7	9	15
.05—.09	2	4	6	5
.00—.04	2		3	1
- 01—- 04			4	1
-.05—-.09			4	2
-.10—-.14			1	
MEDIAN	.26	.21	.19	.15
PER CENT WITH ΔP < .05	4%	0%	17%	6%

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	POINT BISERIAL DISTRIBUTIONS			
	Items Used		Items Not Used	
	Black	Other	Black	Other
.70— 74		3	1	
65— 69		6		3
60— 64	7	6	5	6
.55—.59	8	6	6	9
.50— 54	8	6	3	10
.45— 49	7	8	5	7
40— 44	4	8	11	7
.35— 39	6	4	7	5
.30— 34	2	2	7	7
.25— 29	5	1	5	5
20—.24	1	1	3	2
.15—.19	3		5	5
.10—.14			4	
05— 09			1	2
00— 04			5	
-.01—-.04			1	
-.05—-.09				
.10— .14				1
MEDIAN	48	.51	.37	.45
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	6%	0%	23%	12%

Table 126

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) AND POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR TRYOUT ITEMS USED AND NOT USED BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR THE "END MARKS/COLON/SEMI-COLON" CATEGORY OBJECTIVE OF LEVEL 18 OF CAT C AND D

ΔP INTERVALS	ΔP DISTRIBUTIONS			
	Items Used		Items Not Used	
	Black	Other	Black	Other
.35— 39	2			
30— 34	2	1		
.25—.29	2	2		
.20—.24	5	3		
.15—.19	1		2	1
.10—.14		5	2	5
.05— 09	1	2	1	1
00—.04				
- 01—- 04			1	
- 05—- .09			1	
MEDIAN	24	.14	12	13
PER CENT WITH ΔP < .05	0%	0%	29%	0%

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	POINT BISERIAL DISTRIBUTIONS			
	Items Used		Items Not Used	
	Black	Other	Black	Other
55—.59	1	2		1
.50— 54	1	1		1
.45— 49	1	4		
.40— 44	2	3	2	1
35— 39	4	1	1	
.30— 34	2	1		
25— 29	1	1		
.20— 24	1			
15—.19			1	2
10— 14			1	
05— 09			1	1
00— 04				
- 01—- 04			1	
05— 09				
10— 14				1
MEDIAN	38	46	17	.19
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < 20	0%	0%	57%	57%

TABLE 1

NOTES REGARDING TEST FAIRNESS

TEST BATTERY	CONTENT REVIEW	ITEMS PRETESTED WITH MINORITIES	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF ITEMS FOR FAIRNESS	FINAL FORMS OF TEST
California Achievement Test	Professionally active educators from minority groups.	Extra effort to obtain adequate black sample.	Test-item correlation and difficulty indices used to screen items.	Adhere to publishers' multi-ethnic and equa treatment of sexes guidelines.
Circus - STEP	Minority test specialists and external review panel.	Minorities included in item pretest.	Not reported.	Pictures balanced male/female and variet of ethnic cultural perspectives.
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	Minority, regional urban-rural review committee.	Pretested with Iowa pupils.	Not used to screen but to express balance of final tests.	Male-female references balanced. Items tend to balance in proportions of those analyze as biased.
Metropolitan Achievement	Panel of minority educators and independent authorities.	Items tried on samples representative of national school population.	Item statistics used to screen items. Test-item correlation and difficulty indices.	Gender balance studied and final test screene for bias.
SRA Achievement	Test development staff and outside consultant reviewed all items.	Minority sample including black, Hispanic and American Indian.	P values converted to Z scores. Plotted for national vs. each minority.	Balance of male-female references, roles, settings.

Guidance & Pupil Adjustment Branch
4/6/79

EXHIBIT B

STANDARDIZATION BIAS REPORT

Description of the Bias Studies

Part 5 of Technical Bulletin 1 describes the procedures used to reduce bias in CAT C and D. Data are included from the item tryouts showing that these procedures eliminated a number of items, many of which might otherwise have been used in the final forms of the battery. The inference drawn is that the procedures did reduce bias against black students and, to a lesser degree, against Hispanics. Although this inference is reasonable, it is obviously desirable to examine relevant data from the final version of the tests.

This section compares the tryout data reported in Technical Bulletin 1 with item data from the standardization. The purpose is to demonstrate that bias was indeed reduced by using the data from the special black tryout. As in Technical Bulletin 1, most of the data discussed will be from Levels 12, 15, and 18 of Form C.

The Nature of the Item Bias Data

As was the case in the tryouts, the students in the standardization sample were requested to identify themselves as "Black," "Hispanic," or "Other." The comparisons discussed below are based on the groups so identified and on the total group ("All"); the latter includes students without ethnic identification. During the screening of tryout data, only the data from the Black and Other groups were considered systematically.

The tryout data differed from the standardization data reported here in several ways. First, no effort was made in the tryout to draw a probability sample of the population. Therefore, the standardization groups are not only larger but also more heterogeneous. Second, the tryout data used were collected in the fall of 1975, whereas the standardization data are from the spring 1977 administration. Third, the items at most levels were tried out at three grades, and the sample was augmented by additional black cases in the upper two grades. For example, Level 15 was tried out in the fall in Grades 4, 5, and 6, the black sample being in Grades 5 and 6. However, the standardization data are spring scores from Grades 4 and 5 only.

It should be understood that the bias data discussed here refer to item bias, not score bias. Biased items produce bias in test scores, but the degree to which scores are biased is unknown. The data reported here are (1) the grade-to-grade growth for each item as shown by item difficulties and (2) the relationship of each item to the score for the normed section in which the item appears (point-biserial correlation). Tryout items were correlated with category objective scores rather than normed section (subtest) scores. For this report, the relationship of each item to normed section score will be compared for the groups, since the bias in normed section scores is of the greatest concern.

Note that point biserials are entirely internal to the normed section and therefore can detect only that bias which is more prominent in some items than in others.[7,8] Item growth is a function of time,

---

[7] William H. Angoff, "The Investigation of Test Bias in the Absence of an Outside Criterion." Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Conference on Test Bias, Washington, D.C., December 1975.

[8] Donald Ross Green, "Procedures for Assessing Bias in Achievement Tests." Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Conference on Test Bias, Washington, D.C., December 1975.

which is a relevant external criterion, but its effectiveness as an indicator of bias is diminished by the relative unreliability of differences among growth scores.

The validity of CAT, like that of almost all other academic achievement tests, was established first and foremost by content criteria rather than by external criteria. These content criteria do not differ by ethnic group in most school systems and therefore do not lend themselves to an assessment of bias. (However, see the discussion of content reviews in Technical Bulletin 1, Page 140.) Also, content validity is a function of the total test design[9] and therefore cannot lead directly to judgments of bias for individual items.

Criteria of Item Bias

Two of the main construct validity standards of CAT were used as criteria in screening the tryout items for bias: (1) grade-to-grade growth of each item where curricular emphasis exists, as shown by item difficulties (per cent of right response), and (2) the degree of consistency between each item and the category objective it measures, as shown by the point-biserial correlation. Differences between ethnic groups on these criteria indicate a difference in the validity of an item. Since bias is a matter of differential validity,[10] tryout items that appeared less valid for blacks by these criteria were the ones identified as biased.

Specifically, items for which grade-to-grade growth (ΔP) in the Black group was at least .20 less than in the Other group were called biased, as were those items with point-biserial differences of .20 in favor of the majority group. In both cases, differences favoring the Black group, which occurred far less frequently, were ignored. In addition, items with a point biserial under .20 or grade-to-grade growth less than .05 were considered unsatisfactory for either the Black or Other group. (See Technical Bulletin 1, Pages 14 and 16.)

Another factor in the bias studies was the relationship between point biserials and item difficulties. Although the analyses focused on differences in growth between the Black and Other groups rather than on differences in difficulty per se, the tryout items for a few category objectives were found to be too difficult for the black sample to permit judgments about bias. These sets of items were simply labeled too difficult overall and were not counted as biased items. Because the extremely difficult items were excluded from further consideration and because the black sample was obtained from the upper grades of the intended range, it is unlikely that differences in the distribution of point biserials for the biased and unbiased items were due to the distortion that point biserials suffer when item difficulties are extreme.[11]

It should be remembered that a preponderance of recent educational research strongly indicates that on the average the academic achievement of black and Hispanic children is lower than that of other segments of the population. Therefore, between-group differences in mean test scores do not necessarily imply test bias; instead, such differences may accurately reflect group differences in academic achievement. The guiding principle here is that between-group differences in mean scores cannot be taken as evidence of bias unless other evidence indicates the differences are spurious.

Similar reasoning applies to grade-to-grade growth statistics. There are strong reasons to believe that on the average black and Hispanic children receive a less adequate education than do majority children. Because minority children as a group learn less in school than other children, lower growth is not evidence of bias unless there is some substantial reason to believe otherwise. In the CAT C and D bias studies, tryout items that measured the same category objective were compared. When some items showed much more growth for the majority group than for the minority while others showed much less difference in growth, the former became suspect of bias. However, the most important criterion for item selection was adequate representation of the range of content within each category objective.

Ethnic Characteristics of the Standardization Sample

The procedures for obtaining the standardization sample are described in Part 3 of Technical Bulletin

---

[9] American Psychological Association, American Educational Research Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education, *Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests* (Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1974), pp. 28-29.

[10] Donald Ross Green, "What Does It Mean To Say a Test is Biased?" *Education and Urban Society* Vol. 8, 1975, pp. 35-51.

[11] Nancy S. Cole, "Approaches to Examining Bias in Achievement Test Items," AMEG *Newsnotes* Vol. 13, No. 3, 1978, pp. 4-8.

1. The description of the sample indicates the overall proportions of blacks (14%) and Hispanics (7%) and shows the variations in these proportions that occur in relationship to school type, region, and type of community. Generally speaking, blacks were found most frequently in the Southeast and large cities, while Hispanics, who also tended to be in urban schools, were concentrated in the Southwest and West.

Table 48 shows the number and percentage of students in the spring standardization at each of the three test levels described here who identified themselves as Black, Hispanic, or Other. The analyses that follow are based on the performance of these students. It can be seen that many students did not provide ethnic identification. However, the percentages reported by schools (see Technical Bulletin 1, Table 60) are sufficiently close to those obtained from the identified group to suggest that the group not responding did not differ significantly in ethnic composition from the group responding. Table 48 indicates that the percentages vary a bit from level to level but that in all instances the numbers are large enough for reliable comparisons.

The raw score means and standard deviations obtained in the spring by these groups are shown by grade and level in Tables 49-57. As expected, the minority groups tend to have lower average scores than the Other group. However, all means for all groups are well above chance level. Also shown are the median point biserials of the items at each grade level and the mean grade-to-grade growth of the items. For Level 18, the growth figure is based on the differences between the Grade 7 and Grade 8 difficulties.

Analysis of Item Data

Comparison of Tryout and Standardization Data

The standardization samples were more heterogeneous than the tryout samples, a fact which tends to increase correlations. Thus, it is not surprising that the point biserial medians shown in Tables 49-57 are generally higher than those obtained in the tryout. In general, these medians are reasonably good for all groups. They tend to be slightly higher for the majority group and higher for the higher grade in all groups. The mean grade-to-grade item growth is lower for all groups in the upper grades, as is almost always found in tests that measure basic skills. The fact that growth is somewhat lower in almost all instances for the minority groups explains their lower mean scores.

Tables 58-69 illustrate the differences between the tryout and standardization data for representative subtests and category objectives at Levels 12, 15, and 18. In examining these tables, the user should bear in mind that items falling below the designated cut-points (.05 for ΔP, .20 for point biserial) may vary across ethnic groups. Therefore, the percentages listed in the tables should not be added or averaged across groups.

The differences in point biserials between groups at Level 12 in the Mathematics Concepts and Applications test are negligible (Tables 58 and 59). The differences found in the tryout between the Black group and the Other group are not apparent in the standardization for this test. Only one item did not have an acceptable item-test correlation. This item worked badly for all groups. The growth statistics (ΔP's) at Level 12 (Tables 60 and 61) were also similar for the three groups, except for three items showing low growth for blacks. Again, it seems evident that differences favoring the majority group have been reduced.

The results for the Level 15 vocabulary tests and category objective 32 parallel the Level 12 data just discussed (see Tables 62-65). Note that the between-group differences evident in the tryouts for both the point biserials and the growth statistic have been reduced.

The Level 18 standardization point biserials shown in Tables 66 and 67 are not higher than those from the tryout for the selected items. Nevertheless, the reduced differential remains between the majority and minority groups relative to the rejected items. Again, no entirely unsatisfactory items appeared for any group. The lowest-ranking item is the same item in all three groups in both tables.

The ΔP's at Level 18 are not entirely satisfactory for any of the groups. Therefore, it is evident that growth in the basic skills has slowed substantially for all by Grade 8. A number of the items showed essentially no growth at all. Although overall growth at this level was the smallest among blacks and highest among Hispanics, these differences are slight and of dubious importance in comparison to the general lack of growth. For CAT/C it appears that by Grade 8 differences in achievement among ethnic groups are large and fairly stable relative to differences in growth, which are neither large nor stable.

Implications for Hispanics

The bias reduction procedures used in developing CAT C and D were based entirely on contrasts between the Black and Other groups. Hispanic data were not used for screening purposes. However, as reported in Technical Bulletin 1, there were adequate Hispanic data for part of Level 16. There it appeared that almost two-thirds of the rejected items that were biased against blacks were also biased against Hispanics. Since it is reasonable to assume that the Tryout Edition contained many items biased against Hispanics,[12] one can conclude that the bias reduction procedures lessened bias against Hispanics to some degree.

With some few exceptions, such as the Level 18 ΔP's, the standardization item statistics for Hispanics fall between those for blacks and those for others. By that standard, the procedures helped make the tests more valid for Hispanics. This should not be taken to mean that the tests are appropriate for students whose predominant language is Spanish. The presumption is that almost all the Hispanic group in the standardization use English in school and in study.

Conclusions

The data presented support the following conclusions:

1. The amount of bias against minorities in the Tryout Edition of CAT C and D was probably small in most areas; the test materials functioned reasonably well for all groups at all levels, and the proportion of items labeled biased was small.
2. The use made of the data from a special black tryout sample reduced the amount of bias against blacks; more items that function well for blacks were used than would have been the case otherwise.
3. Some bias against blacks probably remains in the tests, since the item statistics look best for the Other group.
4. The amount of bias against Hispanics was reduced by the procedures; the item statistics for this group look at least as good as they do for the Black group.
5. Some bias against Hispanics probably remains in the test, since the item statistics look best for the Other group.
6. There are probably some items biased against the majority group, since items favoring blacks were not labeled biased.
7. The amount of bias in the Tryout Edition, the amount that this bias was reduced, and the amount remaining all vary by group, by level, and by normed section; all the tables show such variation.

---

[12] Donald Ross Green, "Racial and Ethnic Bias in Achievement Test Construction" (Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1972).

Table 48

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF CASES IN THE CAT/C SPRING STANDARDIZATION BY LEVEL AND ETHNIC GROUP

Level	Grades	Black		Hispanic		Other		All
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N
11	K,1	775	11.4	474	7.0	5566	81.7	7662
12	1,2	986	15.1	390	6.0	5142	78.9	7399
13	2,3	1376	13.6	684	6.8	8045	79.6	11274
14	3,4	787	14.9	375	7.1	4104	77.9	7008
15	4,5	766	12.3	409	6.6	5035	81.0	8560
16	5,6	1361	18.6	408	5.6	5562	75.9	9441
17	6,7	1601	14.6	1138	10.3	8259	75.1	14761
18	7,8,9	4260	15.2	2734	10.3	21050	74.5	40149
19	9,10	3880	14.8	1929	7.4	20359	77.8	34228

Table 49

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 11, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

		BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
Test	Grade	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP
Phonic Analysis	K	7.9	3.8	.37	—	7.3	4.0	.40	—	9.2	4.4	.43	—	9.0	4.4	.43	—
	1	13.5	5.3	.47	.22	13.6	5.9	.50	.25	18.8	5.7	.58	.39	17.5	6.3	.60	.34
Reading Vocabulary	K	3.8	3.3	.54	—	3.7	3.0	.52	—	4.3	3.7	.56	—	4.1	3.7	.57	—
	1	8.4	4.2	.59	.30	7.3	4.0	.57	.25	11.0	3.8	.61	.45	10.2	4.2	.64	.41
Reading Comprehension	K	3.5	3.5	.44	—	6.0	4.6	.47	—	4.4	4.3	.52	—	4.4	4.3	.52	—
	1	9.7	4.6	.50	.31	8.3	4.1	.50	.12	12.8	4.6	.51	.42	11.9	4.9	.55	.38
Language Expression	K	4.9	5.1	.59	—	3.9	4.9	.63	—	5.9	5.4	.59	—	5.5	5.4	.59	—
	1	11.6	4.3	.43	.33	10.5	4.4	.45	.33	14.5	4.8	.54	.43	13.6	5.1	.55	.40
Mathematics Computation	K	2.8	3.3	.49	—	2.9	3.6	.49	—	4.9	4.2	.52	—	4.6	4.1	.51	—
	1	11.0	5.5	.56	.41	12.1	5.4	.58	.46	14.4	4.9	.58	.48	13.6	5.3	.60	.45
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	K	12.0	7.6	.51	—	14.6	6.0	.40	—	16.4	6.8	.45	—	15.9	6.9	.46	—
	1	22.8	7.5	.48	.30	21.8	7.4	.45	.20	27.3	6.8	.51	.30	25.9	7.6	.53	.28

Table 50

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 12, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

Test	Grade	BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
		Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP
Phonic Analysis	1	9.1	4.9	.46	—	10.1	5.6	.50	—	13.6	6.1	.52	—	12.6	6.1	.53	—
	2	12.9	6.3	.55	.15	15.1	6.3	.56	.20	19.2	6.0	.62	.22	17.8	6.6	.63	.21
Structural Analysis	1	4.3	2.3	.40	—	4.0	2.7	.53	—	5.2	2.6	.52	—	5.0	2.6	.50	—
	2	5.9	2.9	.56	.15	6.2	2.4	.53	.20	7.7	2.5	.56	.22	7.3	2.7	.58	.21
Reading Vocabulary	1	5.2	3.3	.48	—	5.5	4.2	.62	—	7.3	4.5	.64	—	6.9	4.4	.62	—
	2	8.1	4.6	.64	.19	9.6	4.5	.67	.28	12.0	3.9	.71	.32	11.2	4.4	.72	.29
Reading Comprehension	1	5.3	3.9	.47	—	5.4	4.7	.56	—	7.6	5.5	.61	—	7.1	5.3	.60	—
	2	9.5	5.5	.57	.21	10.4	5.9	.62	.25	14.3	5.5	.65	.33	13.2	5.9	.65	.31
Spelling	1	10.1	4.5	.46	—	10.6	4.5	.48	—	12.3	4.4	.50	—	11.8	4.6	.51	—
	2	13.4	4.5	.52	.17	14.1	4.4	.58	.17	16.2	3.6	.58	.19	15.5	4.1	.60	.19
Language Mechanics	1	6.8	4.1	.47	—	7.2	4.5	.49	—	9.2	4.7	.53	—	8.7	4.7	.54	—
	2	10.2	5.2	.57	.17	11.6	4.9	.54	.22	14.7	4.2	.54	.27	13.6	4.9	.56	.25
Language Expression	1	10.0	4.1	.42	—	10.0	4.4	.44	—	12.0	5.1	.53	—	11.5	5.1	.52	—
	2	12.8	4.4	.47	.14	13.8	4.6	.51	.19	16.9	4.2	.58	.24	15.9	4.6	.58	.22
Mathematics Computation	1	6.9	5.1	.46	—	8.3	5.7	.51	—	9.6	5.8	.49	—	9.0	5.8	.49	—
	2	14.1	7.1	.56	.28	17.1	6.9	.57	.34	19.4	6.2	.58	.38	18.4	6.8	.60	.36
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	1	14.6	7.0	.41	—	14.7	6.9	.39	—	21.2	7.8	.44	—	19.8	8.1	.45	—
	2	21.9	8.6	.47	.18	23.3	8.2	.48	.21	30.1	7.4	.49	.22	28.2	8.5	.51	.21

Table 51

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 13, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

		BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
Test	Grade	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP
Phonic Analysis	2	7.6	4.0	.44	—	10.0	4.9	.52	—	13.1	5.0	.58	—	12.1	5.2	.58	—
	3	9.5	4.8	.52	.10	12.4	5.1	.58	.12	15.5	4.7	.59	.12	14.4	5.2	.61	12
Structural Analysis	2	5.1	2.5	.50	—	5.7	2.5	.50	—	7.0	2.6	.53	—	6.7	2.7	.52	—
	3	6.4	2.6	.51	.21	7.0	2.8	.55	.11	8.6	2.4	.57	.14	8.1	2.6	.57	.13
Reading Vocabulary	2	5.9	3.1	.45	—	6.9	3.3	.43	—	9.5	3.7	.55	—	8.9	3.9	.54	—
	3	7.7	3.6	.49	.12	8.7	3.9	.55	.12	11.8	3.4	.59	.16	11.1	3.8	.61	.15
Reading Comprehension	2	12.5	5.7	.44	—	13.3	6.1	.49	—	17.9	6.4	.56	—	16.8	6.7	.56	—
	3	15.1	6.3	.50	.10	16.7	6.6	.51	.13	21.5	5.7	.54	.13	20.2	6.3	.57	13
Spelling	2	11.5	3.4	.38	—	11.7	3.6	.39	—	13.4	3.5	.44	—	13.0	3.6	.44	—
	3	13.1	3.6	.47	.08	13.9	3.9	.47	.11	15.3	3.4	.48	.10	14.9	3.6	.49	.09
Language Mechanics	3	7.5	4.1	.43	—	8.7	4.6	.48	—	11.0	4.7	.50	—	10.3	4.8	.51	—
	3	10.3	4.7	.51	.14	12.0	5.4	.57	.17	14.4	4.5	.52	.17	13.6	4.8	.54	.16
Language Expression	2	13.7	4.8	.39	—	14.6	5.4	.42	—	18.7	5.6	.48	—	17.7	5.8	.48	—
	3	16.2	5.5	.43	.10	17.5	5.8	.49	.11	21.5	4.9	.52	.11	20.4	5.4	.52	.11
Mathematics Computation	2	10.3	5.2	.31	—	12.1	6.9	.40	—	14.1	7.1	.42	—	13.5	7.0	.41	—
		18.8	9.3	.52	.21	23.3	9.4	.49	.28	27.2	8.9	.51	.33	25.7	9.4	.53	.31
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	2	13.0	6.6	.34	—	16.6	7.9	.38	—	21.6	9.5	.45	—	20.1	9.6	.46	—
	3	18.6	9.0	.44	.12	23.5	10.4	.50	.15	30.7	9.9	.50	.20	28.5	10.7	.51	.19

Table 52

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 14, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

		BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
Test	Grade	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP
Reading Vocabulary	3	8.7	5.4	.40	—	10.8	6.2	.45	—	16.0	7.9	53	—	14.9	8.0	.53	
	4	11.5	6.2	.43	.09	12.9	7.6	.52	.07	21.6	7.4	.56	19	19.6	8.2	59	16
Reading Comprehension	3	12.0	9.1	.51	—	14.0	7.0	.39	—	19.6	8.9	45	—	18.4	9.1	46	
	4	14.0	9.8	.51	.05	16.2	8.6	.44	.06	25.3	9.4	50	14	22.9	10.0	.51	11
Spelling	3	9.0	3.7	.40	—	9.5	4.0	.43	—	11.1	4.1	44	—	10.7	4.1	42	
	4	10.6	4.0	.41	.08	10.4	4.2	.45	.04	13.1	3.8	.43	.10	12.5	4.0	45	09
Language Mechanics	3	8.5	4.7	.44	—	9.4	4.6	.42	—	12.9	5.3	.46	—	12.0	5.4	46	
	4	10.2	5.2	.45	.07	11.5	5.6	.51	.09	16.3	5.2	49	.14	15.0	5.7	50	12
Language Expression	3	16.8	7.3	.43	—	18.7	6.9	.39	—	24.1	8.0	.47	—	22.7	8.2	47	
	4	19.4	7.4	.42	.07	21.0	8.2	.48	.06	27.9	7.3	.48	.10	26.1	8.1	50	09
Mathematics Computation	3	12.5	6.9	.45	—	13.0	6.8	.40	—	17.9	7.6	.46	—	16.7	7.7	46	
	4	18.0	8.7	.49	.14	19.5	8.6	.49	.16	25.3	8.6	.50	.19	23.9	9.0	51	18
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	3	13.7	7.2	.38	—	13.1	10.0	.54	—	22.4	9.6	.46	—	20.7	10.0	49	
	4	16.9	8.3	.42	.07	19.7	9.4	.44	.15	29.4	9.9	50	16	26.8	10.8	53	14

Table 53

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 15, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

Test	Grade	BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
		Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP
Reading Vocabulary	4	10.5	5.9	.41	—	11.6	5.9	.41	—	19.2	6.8	.49	—	17.7	7.4	.54	—
	5	13.7	6.9	.50	.11	15.2	7.0	.48	.12	22.0	6.8	.54	.09	20.9	7.3	.56	.11
Reading Comprehension	4	12.4	6.7	.37	—	14.2	6.7	.35	—	21.8	9.0	.47	—	20.0	9.3	.49	—
	5	16.1	8.0	.42	.09	16.7	8.7	.45	.06	25.1	9.5	.51	.08	23.7	9.7	.51	.09
Spelling	4	9.2	3.9	.40	—	8.9	3.8	.41	—	11.7	4.1	.45	—	11.1	4.2	.44	—
	5	10.4	4.2	.43	.07	10.5	4.3	.46	.08	13.3	4.1	.47	.08	12.8	4.3	.49	.08
Language Mechanics	4	9.6	5.3	.47	—	10.7	5.1	.44	—	15.1	5.4	.48	—	14.1	5.8	.50	—
	5	10.9	5.6	.48	.05	12.7	5.8	.50	.08	17.3	5.4	.49	.09	16.4	5.8	.51	.09
Language Expression	4	18.6	7.2	.40	—	18.7	7.9	.44	—	26.3	7.1	.44	—	24.9	7.9	.48	—
	5	20.6	7.3	.41	.06	22.7	7.6	.45	.11	28.2	7.1	.47	.05	27.2	7.5	.48	.06
Mathematics Computation	4	12.8	6.8	.40	—	13.5	6.7	.40	—	19.2	7.9	.43	—	18.0	8.0	.44	—
	5	17.6	8.3	.45	.12	19.4	9.2	.50	.15	24.7	8.8	.49	.14	23.8	9.1	.50	.15
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	4	12.8	7.4	.37	—	13.3	7.0	.35	—	22.0	9.4	.44	—	20.2	9.6	.45	—
	5	15.9	8.2	.39	.07	19.1	10.1	.47	.13	27.4	10.0	.49	.12	25.8	10.6	.51	.12

Table 54

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 16, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

		BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
Test	Grade	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt Bis	Mean ΔP
Reading Vocabulary	5	11.2	5.3	.39	—	11.4	6.2	.43	—	18.1	6.6	.48	—	16.6	7.0	50	—
	6	12.6	6.4	.43	.05	13.4	6.8	.46	07	21.1	6.5	.50	.10	19.4	7.3	53	.09
Reading Comprehension	5	14.2	7.1	.38	—	15.2	7.6	.41	—	22.2	8.8	.46	—	20.5	9.0	48	—
	6	16.1	8.0	.43	.05	17.3	8.3	.45	.05	25.5	9.0	.49	.08	23.6	9.5	.50	.08
Spelling	5	9.5	3.8	.41	—	9.4	3.8	.39	—	11.6	3.7	.42	—	11.1	3.8	41	—
	6	10.1	4.0	.42	.03	10.5	3.5	.39	.06	12.7	3.7	.43	.06	12.3	3.9	43	.06
Language Mechanics	5	10.8	5.3	.48	—	11.0	5.6	.52	—	16.1	5.6	.49	—	14.9	5.9	50	—
	6	11.9	6.1	.54	.05	13.5	5.4	.46	.10	17.4	5.4	.49	.05	16.3	5.9	52	.06
Language Expression	5	18.8	6.6	.35	—	19.5	7.2	.40	—	25.8	6.9	.42	—	24.3	7.4	43	—
	6	20.4	7.4	.41	.04	21.6	6.3	.37	.06	27.5	7.0	.45	.04	26.1	7.5	46	.05
Mathematics Computation	5	14.5	6.8	.41	—	16.1	6.7	.39	—	19.2	7.9	44	—	18.4	8.0	44	—
	6	17.2	8.2	.48	.07	19.9	7.9	.44	.09	24.4	9.1	.49	.13	23.1	9.2	.50	.12
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	5	14.5	6.3	.34	—	16.7	6.6	.33	—	22.3	8.7	42	—	20.7	8.8	43	—
	6	16.4	7.7	37	.04	19.1	8.7	.41	05	26.5	9.7	.47	10	24.7	10.1	48	09

Table 55

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 17, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

		BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
Test	Grade	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP
Reading Vocabulary	6	9.6	4.6	.33	—	10.6	5.5	.40	—	16.1	6.7	48	—	15.1	6.8	48	—
	7	11.0	5.6	.40	.05	12.1	6.0	.41	.05	18.5	7.3	.54	.08	16.9	7.6	.54	06
Reading Comprehension	6	13.2	6.9	.38	—	14.6	7.2	.38	—	21.4	8.7	.44	—	20.1	9.0	.45	—
	7	14.9	7.6	.40	.04	16.0	8.0	.41	.03	23.8	9.5	.49	.06	21.8	9.9	.51	.04
Spelling	6	8.6	4.0	.40	—	8.4	4.2	.43	—	11.2	4.3	.46	—	10.8	4.4	.46	—
	7	9.2	4.4	.45	.03	9.7	4.3	.46	.07	12.2	4.4	.49	.05	11.5	4.6	.50	.04
Language Mechanics	6	9.1	4.9	.42	—	10.2	5.3	.48	—	14.4	5.4	.49	—	13.7	5.7	.51	—
	7	10.0	5.3	.45	.03	11.7	5.6	.46	.06	15.5	5.7	.53	.05	14.3	6.1	.53	03
Language Expression	6	17.3	6.5	.37	—	18.3	6.6	.37	—	23.3	6.9	.43	—	20.4	7.2	.43	—
	7	18.4	7.0	.40	.03	19.6	7.0	.38	.03	24.9	7.6	.45	.04	23.5	7.9	.47	.03
Mathematics Computation	6	12.2	5.8	.33	—	13.1	6.0	.34	—	17.2	7.9	.43	—	16.8	8.1	.44	—
	7	13.9	7.3	.42	.04	14.6	7.7	.45	.04	22.1	9.9	.52	.12	20.4	10.2	.54	.09
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	6	11.3	6.0	.33	—	13.4	7.0	.36	—	19.4	8.7	.43	—	18.5	9.0	.44	—
	7	13.2	7.4	.38	.04	14.9	7.7	.40	.04	23.4	10.3	.48	.10	21.3	10.7	.50	.06

Table 56

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP, GRADES 7 TO 8) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 18, CAT/C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

Test	Grade	BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
		Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP
Reading Vocabulary	7	9.5	4.6	.34	—	10.3	5.1	.38	—	15.3	7.0	.49	—	14.3	7.0	.49	—
	8	10.7	5.6	.40	.04	12.8	5.8	.41	.08	18.0	7.4	.53	.09	16.7	7.6	.55	.08
	9	12.2	6.6	.47	—	13.8	6.8	.49	—	19.8	7.4	.56	—	18.4	7.9	.58	—
Reading Comprehension	7	14.9	6.7	.36	—	15.7	7.2	.39	—	22.3	8.9	.47	—	20.9	9.0	.48	—
	8	16.7	7.8	.42	.04	19.5	7.5	.40	.10	25.1	9.0	.50	.07	23.5	9.5	.52	.06
	9	18.6	8.4	.44	—	20.5	8.4	.45	—	26.6	9.1	.52	—	25.0	9.5	.53	—
Spelling	7	8.1	3.6	.39	—	8.2	3.4	.37	—	9.9	3.9	.40	—	9.6	3.9	.40	—
	8	8.9	3.8	.40	.04	9.6	3.6	.38	.07	10.9	4.1	.42	.05	10.5	4.1	.43	.05
	9	9.7	4.1	.44	—	9.8	3.8	.39	—	11.6	4.2	.44	—	11.2	4.3	.44	—
Language Mechanics	7	10.7	5.2	.45	—	12.2	5.6	.47	—	15.4	5.5	.50	—	14.5	5.8	.51	—
	8	11.7	5.2	.46	.04	14.0	5.2	.47	.07	16.6	5.5	.51	.05	15.6	5.8	.52	.05
	9	12.7	5.6	.46	—	14.7	5.4	.49	—	17.3	5.4	.52	—	16.4	5.8	.53	—
Language Expression	7	18.4	6.9	.40	—	19.5	7.2	.43	—	24.9	7.8	.48	—	23.5	8.1	.49	—
	8	20.2	7.4	.43	.05	22.5	7.1	.40	.08	26.7	8.0	.51	.05	25.4	8.4	.52	.05
	9	21.8	7.5	.44	—	23.7	7.7	.45	—	27.8	7.9	.51	—	26.6	8.2	.51	—
Mathematics Computation	7	13.0	6.7	.40	—	13.5	7.0	.44	—	19.9	8.9	.48	—	18.6	9.2	.50	—
	8	15.5	7.9	.46	.06	18.5	8.4	.46	.13	23.9	10.1	.54	.10	22.6	10.3	.54	.10
	9	17.1	9.2	.51	—	19.9	8.8	.49	—	25.8	10.3	.57	—	24.2	10.6	.57	—
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	7	13.0	6.2	.33	—	13.7	6.3	.32	—	21.2	9.1	.44	—	19.7	9.4	.46	—
	8	15.2	7.6	.38	.05	17.9	8.0	.39	.09	25.3	10.4	.49	.09	23.6	10.7	.51	.09
	9	16.9	9.2	.45	—	20.1	9.4	.44	—	27.9	11.0	.53	—	25.8	11.5	.54	—

Table 57

RAW SCORE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, MEDIAN POINT BISERIALS, AND MEAN GROWTH STATISTICS (ΔP) BY TEST AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR LEVEL 19, CAT C, SPRING STANDARDIZATION

Test	Grade	BLACK				HISPANIC				OTHER				ALL			
		Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis.	Mean ΔP	Mean	SD	Median Pt. Bis	Mean ΔP
Reading Vocabulary	9	10.2	4.7	.34	—	10.7	4.9	.35	—	15.0	6.5	.45	—	14.0	6.5	.45	—
	10	11.1	5.7	.40	.03	12.1	6.1	.44	.04	17.0	7.4	.52	.07	15.9	7.5	52	.07
Reading Comprehension	9	15.8	7.6	.40	—	17.2	7.5	.40	—	22.9	8.9	.46	—	21.3	9.1	.47	—
	10	16.8	8.4	.45	.03	18.8	8.3	.45	.04	24.6	9.8	.53	.04	23.2	10.0	53	05
Spelling	9	7.9	3.9	.41	—	7.8	3.6	.37	—	9.4	4.1	.41	—	9.0	4.1	.42	—
	10	8.4	4.2	.45	.03	8.5	4.2	.44	.04	10.1	4.7	.47	.04	9.8	4.6	.47	.04
Language Mechanics	9	10.6	5.0	.40	—	12.0	4.6	.37	—	14.4	5.3	.44	—	13.6	5.4	.44	—
	10	11.2	5.3	.44	.02	12.6	5.2	.42	.02	14.9	5.8	.48	.02	14.3	5.8	.48	03
Language Expression	9	18.7	6.8	.36	—	19.6	6.5	.39	—	23.9	7.8	.46	—	22.7	7.8	.45	—
	10	19.4	7.5	.42	.02	20.9	7.6	.44	.03	24.6	8.7	.54	.02	23.8	8.7	.53	03
Mathematics Computation	9	15.5	8.6	.48	—	18.2	8.5	.48	—	23.9	10.2	.54	—	22.3	10.4	.55	—
	10	16.2	9.5	.51	.02	19.4	9.5	.50	.03	25.0	10.8	.58	.03	23.6	11.1	59	03
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	9	14.6	7.9	.39	—	16.2	7.8	.39	—	22.9	10.1	.48	—	21.2	10.2	.49	—
	10	16.0	9.2	.45	.03	18.2	9.2	.47	.04	25.2	11.2	.53	.05	23.6	11.4	.54	.05

Table 58

POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT AND STANDARDIZATION ITEMS IN THE MATHEMATICS CONCEPTS AND APPLICATIONS TEST OF LEVEL 12, CAT/C

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.70—.74								
.65—.69								
.60—.64				3		1	1	3
.55—.59		2		5	5	5	9	9
.50—.54	3	3	2	6	8	10	8	11
.45—.49		11	5	8	14	11	11	10
.40—.44	3	8	8	11	2	3	8	4
.35—.39	9	9	11	19	6	3	1	1
.30—.34	11	5	14	9	1	4	1	1
.25—.29	3	1	20	15	3	2		
.20—.24	5		5	5	1			
.15—.19	4	1	15	7		1	1	1
.10—.14	1		15	12				
.05—.09	1		3	3				
.00—.04			5	6				
−.01—−.04			3					
−.05—−.09			2					
−.10—−.14			1					
−.15—−.19								
MEDIAN	.32	.42	.26	.33	46	47	.49	.51
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	15%	3%	40%	26%	0%	3%	3%	3%

Table 59

POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT AND STANDARDIZATION ITEMS MEASURING CATEGORY OBJECTIVE 79, "NUMBER SENTENCES/PROPERTIES," IN LEVEL 12, CAT/C

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.70—.74								
.65—.69								
.60—.64						1	2	2
.55—.59		1			2	3	4	4
.50—.54	1			1	3	3	1	1
.45—.49		2			2			
.40—.44		1		1				
.35—.39	2	1	2	5				
.30—.34	1	1	3	2				
.25—.29	1	1	3	2				
.20—.24	1			1				
.15—.19	1		4	1				
.10—.14								
.05—.09								
.00—.04								
−.01—−.04								
−.05—−.09			1					
−.10—−.14								
−.15—−.19								
MEDIAN	.32	.42	.28	.36	.54	.55	.58	.56
PERCENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	14%	0%	38%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 60

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT AND STANDARDIZATION ITEMS IN THE MATHEMATICS CONCEPTS AND APPLICATIONS TEST OF LEVEL 12, CAT/C

ΔP INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.45—.49			1	1				
.40—.44		1	1	2				
.35—.39	2	1	2	5	1	2		
.30—.34	7	2	3	2	2	5	7	1
.25—.29	2	3	7	9	5	5	7	11
.20—.24	5	8	9	12	8	8	13	12
.15—.19	9	13	12	8	10	12	7	11
.10—.14	8	3	17	14	7	5	3	1
.05—.09	5	8	23	15	4	3	3	4
.00—.04	1		15	28	3			
−.01—−.04		1	13	11				
−.05—−.09	1		4	2				
−.10—−.14			2					
MEDIAN	.17	.18	.09	.09	.17	.20	.22	.20
PER CENT WITH ΔP < .05	5%	3%	31%	38%	8%	0%	0%	0%

Table 61

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT AND STANDARDIZATION ITEMS MEASURING CATEGORY OBJECTIVE 79, "NUMBER SENTENCES/PROPERTIES," IN LEVEL 12, CAT/C

ΔP INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.45—.49								
.40—.44								
.35—.39	1				1			
.30—.34	1					1	2	1
.25—.29	1		1			2	2	2
.20—.24		2	2	2		1	2	3
.15—.19	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	1
.10—.14	3	1	2	3	2	1		
.05—.09		1	4	5				
.00—.04			1	1	1			
−.01—−.04			1					
−.05—−.09								
−.10—−.14								
MEDIAN	17	17	12	11	15	22	26	23
PER CENT WITH ΔP < .05	0%	0%	15%	8%	14%	0%	0%	0%

Table 62

POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) ITEMS IN THE READING VOCABULARY TEST OF LEVEL 15

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.70—.74								
.65—.69		3						1
.60—.64	2	9		10	1	3	7	7
.55—.59	1	13	1	24	2	5	4	9
.50—.54	6	7	7	18	9	2	9	6
.45—.49	8	10	16	14	5	8	4	2
.40—.44	4	7	14	7	7	5	5	4
.35—.39	7	5	11	7	1	3	1	1
.30—.34	8	1	13	8	4	2		
.25—.29	6	1	11	6	1	2		
.20—.24	4	1	8	2				
.15—.19	6		5	1				
.10—.14	1		5	3				
.05—.09	3		5	1				
.00—.04			2	1				
−.01—−.04			1					
−.05—−.09			2	1				
−.10—−.14			1					
−.15—−.19	1		1					
MEDIAN	.35	.52	.30	.51	.46	.47	.53	.56
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	19%	0%	21%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 63

POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) ITEMS MEASURING CATEGORY OBJECTIVE 53, "COMMA," IN LEVEL 18

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.70—.74								
.65—.69								
.60—.64		4		1		1	1	3
.55—.59		6	1	5	2	2	5	7
.50—.54	2	6	1	4	3	2	7	4
.45—.49	4	8	5	6	7	7	4	2
.40—.44	3	6	2	1	3	2	3	4
.35—.39	4	5	3	4	1	3		
.30—.34	6		3	6	3	2		
.25—.29	5	1	3	3	1	1		
.20—.24	2	1	3					
.15—.19	6		2					
.10—.14	1		4	1				
.05—.09	3		3					
.00—.04			1	1				
−.01—−.04								
−.05—−.09								
−.10—−.14			1					
−.15—−.19	1							
MEDIAN	.30	.48	.29	.47	.45	.45	.52	.54
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	27%	0%	34%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 64

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) ITEMS IN THE READING VOCABULARY TEST OF LEVEL 15

ΔP INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.45—.49								
.40—.44								
35—.39								
.30—.34	1							
.25—.29	1		1					
.20—.24	3	3	3	7	1	1		
.15—.19	3	10	8	19	2	9		
.10—.14	5	33	14	39	14	9	15	18
.05—.09	13	10	17	22	9	9	13	12
.00—.04	17	1	24	14	4	2	2	
−.01—−.04	6		13	2				
−.05—−.09	6		16					
−.10—−.14	2		7					
MEDIAN	.04	.12	.03	.11	.10	.12	.10	.11
PER CENT WITH ΔP < .05	54%	2%	58%	16%	13%	7%	7%	0%

Table 65

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) ITEMS MEASURING CATEGORY OBJECTIVE 32, "SAME MEANING," IN LEVEL 15

ΔP INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.45—.49								
.40—.44								
.35—.39								
.30—.34	1							
.25—.29	1							
.20—.24	2	1	1		1			
.15—.19	2	4	6		2	4		
.10—.14	2	22	5	13	9	7	8	8
.05—.09	10	9	4	13	4	7	10	12
00—.04	12	1	3	6	4	2	2	
−.01—−.04			2					
−.05—−.09	5		6					
−.10—−.14	2		5					
MEDIAN	.04	.12	04	.08	.11	.11	.09	.09
PER CENT WITH ΔP < .05	51%	3%	50%	19%	20%	10%	10%	0%

Table 66

POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) ITEMS IN THE LANGUAGE MECHANICS TEST OF LEVEL 18

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.70—.74		3	1					
.65—.69		6		3				1
.60—.64	7	6	5	6	2	1	3	4
.55—.59	8	6	6	9	3	3	4	4
.50—.54	8	6	3	10	2	5	9	8
.45—.49	7	8	5	7	6	5	3	2
.40—.44	4	8	11	7	6	5	4	5
.35—.39	6	4	7	5	1	1	1	
.30—.34	2	2	7	7	3	4	1	1
.25—.29	5	1	5	5	1	1		
.20—.24	1	1	3	2	1			
.15—.19	3		5	5				
.10—.14			4					
.05—.09			1	2				
.00—.04			5					
−.01—−.04			1					
−.05—−.09								
−.10—−.14				1				
−.15—−.19								
MEDIAN	.48	.51	.37	45	46	47	.51	.52
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS. < .20	6%	0%	23%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 67

POINT BISERIAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) CATEGORY OBJECTIVE 53, "COMMA," IN LEVEL 18

POINT BISERIAL INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
70—.74								
65—.69								
.60—.64								
.55—.59	1	2		1		1	1	3
.50—.54	1	1		1	1			2
.45—.49	1	4				1	1	
.40—.44	2	3	2	1	1		2	
.35—.39	4	1	1		1	1	1	
.30—.34	2	1			2	2	1	
.25—.29	1	1				1		
.20—.24	1				1			
.15—.19			1	2				
.10—.14			1					
.05—.09			1	1				
.00—.04								
-.01—-.04			1					
-.05—-.09								
-.10—-.14				1				
-.15—-.19								
MEDIAN	38	46	17	19	35	.35	41	.55
PER CENT WITH PT. BIS < .20	0%	0%	57%	57%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 68

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) ITEMS IN THE LANGUAGE MECHANICS TEST OF LEVEL 18

ΔP INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.45—.49								
.40—.44	1	1	5	3				
.35—.39	8	5	5	2				
.30—.34	11	3	3	2				
.25—.29	8	11	8	11				
.20—.24	10	7	12	10				
.15—.19	6	13	9	17				
.10—.14	3	7	9	15	1	8		
.05—.09	2	4	6	5	11	11	12	14
.00—.04	2		3	1	11	4	13	11
−.01—−.04			4	1	2	2		
−.05—−.09			4	2				
−.10—−.14			1					
MEDIAN	.26	.21	.19	.15	.05	.08	.02	.05
PER CENT WITH $\Delta P < .05$	4%	0%	17%	6%	52%	24%	52%	44%

Table 69

GROWTH STATISTIC (ΔP) FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR TRYOUT (CAT C AND D) AND STANDARDIZATION (CAT/C) ITEMS MEASURING CATEGORY OBJECTIVE 53, "COMMA," IN LEVEL 18

ΔP INTERVALS	TRYOUT DATA				STANDARDIZATION DATA			
	Items Used		Items Not Used					
	Black	Other	Black	Other	Black	Hispanic	Other	All
.45—.49								
.40—.44								
.35—.39	1							
.30—.34	1							
.25—.29	1	2						
.20—.24	3	1						
.15—.19			2	1				
.10—.14		2	2	5	1	1		
.05—.09	1	2	1	1	3	4	3	2
.00—.04					2	1	3	4
−.01—−.04			1					
−.05—−.09			1					
−.10—−.14								
MEDIAN	.24	.14	.12	.13	.05	.07	.05	.04
PER CENT WITH $\Delta P < .05$	0%	0%	29%	0%	33%	17%	50%	66%

EXHIBIT C

SPECIAL EDUCATION

COPY

CITY-WIDE ACHIEVEMENT TESTS - 1985-86

FEBRUARY 10-14, 1986

PRINCIPAL'S/TEST COORDINATORS HANDBOOK
FOR THE
CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

TESTING SECTION, EVALUATION BRANCH
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DECEMBER, 1985

AS IN PAST YEARS, BE SURE TO

REMIND YOUR STAFF THAT

THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

ARE TO BE GIVEN ONLY IN

READING AND MATHEMATICS

FORM C - GRADES 1-3	LEVELS 11-13
FORM D - GRADES 4-11	LEVELS 14-19

TO: Principals/Test Coordinators

FROM: Bernard Barbadora, Testing

DATE: December, 1985

RE: Administration of the California Achievement Tests, February, 1986

This booklet contains materials that we feel will make your job of coordinating the achievement testing program in your school easier and a success. Students in Special Education programs will be tested this year in February.

It will be necessary for you to meet with all the teachers who will be involved in the test administration to review these materials. We suggest that you meet with teachers in either grade or program groups one week prior to test administration.

Pupils in grades 1-3 and levels 11-13 will record their answers in the test booklet. Pupils in grades 4-11 and levels 14-19 will use an answer sheet. Teachers in grade 4 and level 14 should arrange for instruction time to inform pupils about the use of an answer sheet. This will be the first time most pupils in grade 4 and level 14 will have used an answer sheet for achievement testing.

After you have reviewed these general plans, the teachers, as a group, are to go over the specific directions in the Examiner's Manual (provided with materials) for each subtest, and teacher checklist. This will lead to a more standardized test administration.

Seven important points to remember:

1. All test materials should be inventoried and discrepancies reported immediately to the Testing Section. Remember, we will be calling you if the shipping and receiving orders don't match.
2. All teachers are encouraged to go over the test for the grade or grades they teach and review the types of material and items on the test. You should provide two (2) copies of each test level to your school library or librarian for teacher access one week before and during the testing period. The test should be reviewed in the library and should not be removed by any teacher. Teachers should not have copies of the test in their possession except during test administration. After test administration the library copies must also be returned. (Inform librarian about this directive.)
3. Keep all other test materials secured until time of testing. Exception will be primary level booklets. These need to be given to primary teachers one week prior to testing so student's name, number, etc. can be coded. After this is done, material must be returned to your office.

4. Principal's/Test Coordinators should pick up (or have delivered) the tests themselves on the date of testing. Once testing has concluded, teachers should be informed to return all test materials to a secure place within ten minutes after the testing session. In other words, the partially completed test booklets should not be kept in the examiner's possession between testing sessions. No one but the principal or his/her designee should have access to test booklets and answer sheets between testing sessions.

5. Group Information Sheets (received in test cartons)--assure that teachers place this sheet on top of the group of students related to the teacher's name on the sheet with whom you want the results associated.

6. Make sure there is only one test level and/or grade behind each Group Information Sheet.

7. Complete the Test Order Return form and return it in an envelope to Jolene Sweet, Testing Section, immediately after testing and keep separate from other test materials.

If you have any questions, please call me, 369-4093.

BMB:ws

12/85

SPECIAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT TESTING CALENDAR

CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SPRING, 1986

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Order Forms for materials to be sent to Testing Section no later than	December 18, 1985
Staff Assignment Schedules to be sent to Testing Section	December 18, 1985
All test materials will be sent to individual schools	January 27-31, 1986
All tests to be administered by schools	February 10-14, 1986
All test materials to be sent to Testing Section for scoring	February 18-24, 1986
All make up tests to be administered by school	February 18-21, 1986
All makeup test materials to be returned	February 24-28, 1986
Available reports sent to schools	March 21, 1986

Testing Section

CHECKLIST FOR PRINCIPALS

1. CHECK IN TEST MATERIALS

____Check materials sent from Testing Section and return Test Material Receipt Form (in TEST MATERIALS envelope - enclosed)

____If additional materials are needed call Jolene Sweet, 369-4093.

____ Keep materials in a secure place.

2. MEET WITH TEACHERS IN GROUPS, BY PROGRAM

____Go over your local school testing schedule and give times and dates to teachers. Total testing time is about two and a half hours.

____Explain details of the test administration.

____Distribute testing materials, Teacher's Checklist, Examiner's Manual, Practice Test, but NOT tests themselves to teachers in adequate time for them to be thoroughly acquainted with testing procedures: practice test should be administered prior to testing for levels 11-13.

____Stress need for a standardized test administration (e.g. accurately time the test).

____Stress importance of accuracy in gridding pupil's name and student number as it appears on the student ID Lists provided (in TEST MATERIALS carton - forthcoming).

____Ask teachers to arrange booklets or answer sheets in alphabetical order with name and student number grid up.

____Emphasize need for pupils to use No. 2 pencils or special pencils you may have ordered.

____Give specific instructions as to whom teachers should give completed booklets or answer sheets and unused materials. All tests must be accounted for.

____Mainstreamed students should be tested as part of the "Regular" student testing program.

____Try to test in students' regular classroom.

Testing Section: 12/85

PREPARE TESTS AND ANSWER SHEETS TO BE SENT TO TESTING SECTION.

____Keep tests by level.

____Check each Group Information Sheet (in TEST MATERIALS carton) to be sure that the teacher's name that is on this sheet is the teacher you want results associated with even though s/he did not administer the test.

____Do NOT have test examiners "clean up" booklets or answer sheets as in the past. We will do this.

3. DISTRIBUTING TESTS

____On day of testing, distribute tests to your examiners for test administration.

4. PACKAGING FOR RETURNING MATERIALS TO TESTING SECTION.

____Assemble tests by level with Group Information Sheet on top of each group for which a separate roster is desired. Make sure level and grade agree.

____Account for all booklets (used and unused).

____Pack all test materials in cartons in which they were received.

____Place the completed Test Order in an envelope and send to Jolene Sweet, Testing Section, immediately and separate from all other test materials.

____Have cartons sealed and ready for Pony pickup according to Pony schedule. Make sure you number cartons. (Example 1 of 3, 2 of 3, 3 of 3).

____The unused test materials should be separated and maintained at the school for makeup testing during the following week.

____All completed test materials should be organized and returned immediately to Testing Section.

____Makeup tests, library copies and all other test materials should be returned at the end of the second week. The box should be marked "Makeup Tests."

MATERIALS INCLUDED IN TEST MATERIALS ENVELOPE FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

1. Test Material Receipt Form (yellow)
2. Test Order Forms
3. Teacher Check Lists

MATERIALS INCLUDED IN CARTON FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

1. Group Information Sheets (lavender)
2. Student I.D. Sheets - Alphabetical by Homeroom
3. Blank Answer Sheets (Levels 14-19)
4. Envelopes for Returning answer sheets
5. Paper Strips for Banding Test Books
6. Return Labels

PONY SCHEDULE

Test materials should be received and returned on the dates listed.

MONDAY

Received	Returned
Jan. 27	Feb. 24

MORNING

Bond Hill	8:45
Swifton	9:05
Crest Hills	9:15
Woodward/CAMAS	9:30
Losantiville	9:45
Roselawn/Condon	9:55
Hartwell	10:05
Carthage	10:45
Clifton	11:00

AFTERNOON

Millvale	1:00
Chase	1:15
Schwab	1:25
Kirby Road	1:40
Mt. Airy	1:55
College Hill	2:10
Aiken	2:25
Pleasant Hill	2:40
CAPE	2:55
Winton Terrace	3:10
Winton Place	3:25

TUESDAY

Received	Returned
Jan. 28	Feb. 18

MORNING

Withrow	8:45
Peoples	9:05
Kilgour	9:15
Hyde Park	9:25
Anderson Pl.	9:35
Bramble	9:50
Linwood	10:15
Mt. Washington	10:40
Eastern Hills	11:00
McKinley	11:20

AFTERNOON

Oyler	1:20
Sayler Park	1:50
Roberts	2:15
Roosevelt	2:30
No. Fairmount	2:45
Heinold	3:05
Roll Hill	3:15

WEDNESDAY

Received	Returned
Jan. 29	Feb. 19

MORNING

Whittier	8:45
Quebec Heights	8:55
Carson	9:10
Covedale	9:40
Western Hills	9:50
Dater	10:10
Midway	10:30
Cheviot	10:45
Westwood	11:00
Gamble	11:15
Cent. Fairmount	11:30

AFTERNOON

Wm. Howard Taft	1:30
Rothenberg	1:40
SCPA	1:50
Washington Park	2:10
Robert A. Taft	2:20
Bloom	2:50
Heberle	3:05
Sands	3:15
Washburn	3:30

THURSDAY

Received	Returned
Jan. 30	Feb. 20

MORNING

Vine	8:45
Fairview	8:55
Hughes	9:05
Schiel	9:20
Rockdale	9:40
So. Avondale	9:55
Hoffman	10:05
Parham	10:15
Sawyer	10:25
Douglass	10:35
Windsor	10:50

AFTERNOON

Merry	1:15
No. Avondale	1:25
Burton	1:35
Walnut Hills	1:45
Pleasant Ridge	2:15
Shroder	2:35
Woodford	2:45
Silverton	3:00

Hays
Porter
} Should receive and return materials on MONDAY.

Level 11

NUMBER OF ITEMS AND TIME LIMITS FOR LEVEL 11, CAT/C

NORMED SECTION	NUMBER OF ITEMS	APPROXIMATE INSTRUCTION TIME+	WORKING TIME+	APPROXIMATE TOTAL TIME+
Phonic Analysis*	25			25
Reading Vocabulary*	15			12
Reading Comprehension	20	6	20	26
TOTAL READING	60			63
Mathematics Computation	20	8	14	22
Mathematics Concepts and Applications*	36			30
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	56			52

*Test read by examiner. Therefore, approximate instruction time and working time are not listed.
+Time in minutes.

Level 12

NUMBER OF ITEMS AND TIME LIMITS FOR LEVEL 12, CAT/C

NORMED SECTION	NUMBER OF ITEMS	APPROXIMATE INSTRUCTION TIME+	WORKING TIME+	APPROXIMATE TOTAL TIME+
Phonic Analysis*	25			25
Structural Analysis*	11			14
Reading Vocabulary*	15			13
Reading Comprehension	20	3	20	23
TOTAL READING	71			75
Mathematics Computation	26	7	19	26
Mathematics Concepts and Applications*	40			33
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	66			59

*Test read by examiner. Therefore, approximate instruction time and working time are not listed.
+Time in minutes.

Level 13

NUMBER OF ITEMS AND TIME LIMITS FOR LEVEL 13, CAT C AND D

NORMED SECTION	NUMBER OF ITEMS	APPROXIMATE INSTRUCTION TIME+	WORKING TIME+	APPROXIMATE TOTAL TIME+
Phonic Analysis*	20			20
Structural Analysis*	11			14
Reading Vocabulary*	15			11
Reading Comprehension	27	3	27	30
TOTAL READING	73			75
Mathematics Computation	40	3	20	23
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	45	3	35	38
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	85			61

*Test read by examiner. Therefore, approximate instruction time and working time are not listed.
+Time in minutes.

Levels 14-19

NUMBER OF ITEMS AND TIME LIMITS FOR LEVELS 14-19, CAT C AND D

NORMED SECTION	NUMBER OF ITEMS	APPROXIMATE INSTRUCTION TIME+	WORKING TIME+	APPROXIMATE TOTAL TIME+
Reading Vocabulary	30	6	10	16
Reading Comprehension	40	3	35	38
TOTAL READING	70			54
Mathematics Computation	40	3	25	20
Mathematics Concepts and Applications	45	3	35	38
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	85			66

+Time in minutes.

PLANNING FOR TESTING

The tests must be given under standard conditions. An effort should be made to create a testing situation that allows students to do their best. Teachers and examiners should be careful to communicate interest rather than anxiety to the students.

Scheduling

It is preferable to schedule a time early in the school day. Complete testing in three days. If possible, testing should be scheduled on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. The testing room should be well ventilated, and not crowded. With students in grades 1-8, it is generally required to test in the students' own classroom in groups that do not exceed thirty students. Teachers who have a group for either reading or math should administer the test.

If teacher aides are used to assist teacher examiners in administering the tests, they should be thoroughly instructed to ensure that the tests are administered according to the directions. The instructions for administering the tests given in the Examiner's Manual should be closely followed.

Testing Materials

When the test materials arrive, verify that the materials are complete and correct. Acquaint the teachers with the materials, alerting them to any special aspects of the testing program.

TRAINING TEACHER EXAMINERS

You should spend some time training the personnel who will serve as examiners. Suggested duties and recommendations for the examiners are listed below.

Duties of Teacher Examiners

1. Read carefully Parts 2 and 3 of the Examiner's Manual. (This is essential for everyone.)
2. Take the test by using example batteries in the library. Read the directions aloud, learn how to mark the answers, and note the time limits.
3. Provide a positive and supportive atmosphere for the testing situation to reduce student anxiety. Emphasize the schoolwide needs for quiet, order, and seriousness of purpose during the testing period.
4. Have all materials assembled for quick distribution.
5. Read all directions to the students clearly and distinctly.
6. Make sure that the students understand what they are to do before you begin timing the test.
7. Allow time for questions before beginning the testing session.
8. Follow the timing procedures exactly as given in the Examiner's Manual.
9. Observe the students to make certain they understand the instructions, have the proper test page, and mark answers in the designated places.

10. If the printed directions appear to be inadequate, add supplementary remarks as necessary, but never give any student the rationale for, or answer to, any test item. (Additional information on Clarifying Directions is provided below.)

11. Try to prevent students from looking at a neighbor's paper. Special precautions, such as moving desks farther apart before testing, may be necessary to discourage the sharing of answers.

12. In large testing rooms, assign aides or proctors to specific portions of the room and direct them to assume responsibility for the students in that area. You should have proctors at a rate of 30 to 1.

13. If a student's entire test battery is nonvalid because of cheating, did not take test seriously, illness, or other interrupting cause, that student's answer sheet or marked test book should not be put in the stack with others. Mark it "Nonvalid" and return it separately to the person in charge.

14. If one or more subtests are nonvalid but others are valid, the examiner should erase all answers for the affected test.

15. Student test booklets and/or answer sheets that are incomplete may be included in the regular stack. The score will be printed for the subtests that were taken.

Clarifying Directions

Although all directions should be read exactly as they are stated in the Examinier's Manual, there are frequent opportunities throughout the tests to clarify directions for the class or for individuals. They may be done as the sample items are being worked with the students, as well as at the times the examiner is instructed to ask, "Are there any Questions?" The Examiner's Manual instructs the examiner to make sure that the students understand the directions before telling them to begin each test.

Further opportunity to clarify directions is provided while the students are taking the test. As stated in Part 2 of the Examiner's Manual, help may be given to individual students during the test, as long as assistance is limited to the mechanical aspects of marking answers, clarifying directions, and finding the right place on answer sheets. Guard against indicating a correct answer or pointing out the rationale of an item.

When students' test results are to be reported relative to national norms. the most valid report will be obtained by simulating as rigorously as possible the conditions under which the standardization testing was done. An effort should be made before the testing to eliminate any possible distractions such as bells, telephones, and outside noises.

TRAINING AIDES/PROCTORS

Suggested duties and recommendations for aides are listed below. This list should be made available to aides and the teacher examiners responsible for their training.

1. Be a "Hawk Eye".
2. Become familiar with the contents of the test and the directions before the testing begins.

3. Make certain that you know exactly which students in the testing area are your responsibility.
4. Watch the progress of each student in your testing area.
5. Move quietly about your area throughout the testing session.
6. Do not look over any one student's shoulder long enough to make the student uncomfortable.
7. Make certain that each student is following the directions.
8. Encourage any student who marks answers without reading the test items to study each item carefully. Note the student's name and report the behavior to the examiner after the testing session.
9. If any students finish a test before the time is up, encourage them to check their work on that test and only that test.
10. Prevent cooperation between students. Advise the examiner if there is evidence of cheating. Do not accuse a student of cheating during the test.
11. Follow the examiner's directions in distributing and collecting the test materials.
12. Do not converse unnecessarily with the examiner, or with a student during actual testing.

PREPARING FOR SCORING

Assembling Materials

All marked test books or answer sheets to be scored should be assembled, labeled, packaged, and returned in accordance with the instructions on the Principal's Checklist (see page 3). You should provide each examiner with explicit directions for assembling the group's test materials.

1. Fill in Group Information Sheet and place on top of used test booklets or answer sheets.
2. Count unused materials. Account for all materials and return to proper office or person in charge.
3. The unused test materials should be separated and maintained at the school for makeup testing during the following week.
4. All completed test materials should be organized and returned immediately to the Testing Section.
5. Makeup tests, library copies and all other test materials should be returned at the end of the second week. The box should be marked "Makeup Tests."

Make sure teachers pay special attention and follow the directions to the letter on the Group Information Sheet. Remember, this is critical because the student answer sheets/booklets that accompany this sheet is the way the test results for these students will be analyzed and associated with the teacher.

EXHIBIT D

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CORPORATION
7500 OLD OAK BOULEVARD, CLEVELAND, OH 44130 (216)234-5300

November 25, 1985

Dr. Bernard Barbadora
Cincinnati Public Schools
230 East 9th Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Dear Dr. Barbadora:

I am writing this letter to clarify the procedures used to control for ethnic, cultural, and sex bias in the development of the Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test, which was published in 1967. As you may know, many of the statistical procedures to detect evidence of item or test bias were developed in the mid to late 1970's, and it was not until this time that most test developers applied these techniques to the materials they were producing. Prior to this time, more informal bias detection procedures were used. These procedures, which were used with OLMAT and other tests, involved primarily editorial review at the item development, field testing, and test assembly stages. If you were to review technical manuals for tests published prior to 1972, for example, you are likely to find little, if any, discussion of bias issues. Subsequently, and concurrent with the increasing impact of the Civil Rights movement, more and more attention has been, and continues to be, focused on these issues in the test development process.

I hope that this letter provides the information you need. Please let us know if you need further clarification.

Sincerely,

Joanne M. Lenke, Ph.D.
Director
Measurement Division

JML:lc
2496K

cc: Christine Kempf

HARCOURT BRACE JOVANOVICH, PUBLISHERS

EXHIBIT E

Metropolitan Achievement Tests

1978 Edition

Special Report

NUMBER 16

STEPS USED TO ELIMINATE ETHNIC "BIAS"

Potential "bias" in standardized test items is a topic of great concern to test builders and test users. In recent years, the professional literature and some members of the educational profession have stated the belief that achievement and aptitude tests exhibit "bias" against certain racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups. This Report sets out the measures adopted to eliminate such "bias" from the fifth edition of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. It then describes research undertaken to determine the success of these measures, and explains some problems inherent in statistical detection of item "bias."

RECEIVED

APR 9 1979

TESTING
SERVICES

The Psychological Corporation
A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Copyright © 1978 by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in U.S.A.

The question of item "bias" in standardized tests (or "test bias") has received much attention in testing and research circles. Basically, item "bias" may be defined as the extent to which a test item (and, by extension, a test including such items), by its content or psychometric properties, can be shown to function differently for different groups within the population.

Many factors must be considered before deciding whether a test includes "biased" items. First, can the item be shown to function in a systematically different way for two different groups; was the item tried out on a sample sufficiently large and well-defined to show that it does indeed function differentially? This is an objective definition of "bias." The second half of this report describes attempts to detect this kind of bias in the 1978 Metropolitan. A second kind of "bias" is defined subjectively: does the item exhibit non-psychometric characteristics which can be tagged as biased against any particular culture or subgroup in the population for which the test is intended? These possible characteristics include "biased" artwork, vocabulary typical of only one segment of the population, etc.

In an attempt to construct tests with as little "ethnic bias" as possible, both subjective and objective rating procedures were used on items written for the 1978 Metropolitan Achievement Tests. The work of the monority advisory panel (subjective raters) and the statistical procedures used on items (objective measures) are described below.

Advisory Panel of Minority Educators

In the earliest authorial meetings concerning what is now the 1978 Metropolitan series, the issue of minority concerns was addressed at length. At that time, it was decided to select an advisory panel that would meet with the authors and editorial staff periodically throughout the test development, not only at item review stages.

During these discussions, it was decided to select a small group of advisers, all sensitive to minority concerns, and all actively involved in education. The authors decided to include four panelists, two members each from public elementary or secondary schools and university education departments. Nominations were sought from the Metropolitan (and other Psychological Corporation) authors, in-house professional staff, and several other sources. Nominees were contacted concerning possible interest in the project and their vitae requested. At a subsequent publisher-authors meeting, approximately 15 nominees were considered. From among these possible panelists, four were chosen. One original panel member, after attending early meetings and making an initial content review, was unable to complete the project for personal reasons. The final members were:

Mr. William Brown
Assistant Superintendent for
Elementary Education
Newark Public Schools
Newark, New Jersey

Dr. Flora Ortiz
Assistant Professor of Education and
Mexican-American Studies
University of California at Riverside
Riverside, California

Dr. Delcenia Powell
Professor of Reading
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

The role of the panelists can best be explained by outlining the five major steps in building a major test series such as the Metropolitan. These are: blueprinting, content development, item analysis, standardization, and publication. The role of the Advisory Panel at each of these stages was:

Blueprinting: Panel members discussed with authors and editors the basic outline or scheme of the tests. They also provided input as to potential problem areas or content of special pertinence or irrelevance to minority students. Various interpretive and test reporting plans for the final series were suggested by the minority panel.

349

Content Development: Panelists reviewed all test items and preliminary directions for the tests and made suggestions as to potential item "bias," insensitive content, and unclear or potentially "biased" artwork.

When each member of the panel had rated each item, the opinions were collected and tallied. Over 95% of the items were rated "Unbiased" by the panel. The items questioned by one or more members were separated from the item pool, and carefully reviewed by the editorial staff and revised according to the suggestions of the panel member or members who commented on the item. If an item could not be satisfactorily revised, it was eliminated from the item pool. Very few items had to be discarded for reasons of potential bias.

Item Analysis: The panel reviewed plans for the research program, and discussed with authors and editors the intended special analysis of "test bias" planned for this program. (This study is discussed below.)

Standardization: Panel members reviewed standardization and other research plans. They then reinspected all items detected statistically as being potentially biased before the items were included on the tests to be standardized.

Publication: Panelists reviewed near-final drafts of the Teacher's Manual for Administering and Interpreting the tests and offered comments and suggestions. They also discussed final reporting plans and suggested special needs of minority youngsters as concerns test reporting.

Statistical Analysis for Item "Bias"

The two samples used for the statistical detection of possible item bias were the regular, total Metropolitan Item Analysis sample and a special "Large City" sample. The regular sample included 44 school systems selected to be representative of the nation's schools in terms of socioeconomic level, size of school system, and geographic region. In these systems, approximately 92,000 students in Grades K-12 were tested. Included in this sample were appropriate percentages of ethnic minority and large-city pupils.

From the total sample of schools, five large cities (all over 250,000 in population, four over 1 million) were selected to provide a subsample for the "bias" study. These five school systems--New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, St. Louis, and Hartford--agreed to test an additional sample of students in Grades 2-5. This subsample was comprised of students in school buildings that, by self-definition, enrolled 80% or more "minority" pupils. Thus, the Large City sample was drawn from a population that is urban, has high minority representation, and generally has lower socioeconomic status. Thus, the comparisons in this study were between the item performance of a Large City sample versus that of a representative national sample (including other large-city pupils), rather than simply a comparison of "Blacks," "Hispanics," and "Whites."

For each grade tested, the large-city sample was tested "out-of-level"--i.e., with a test level normally intended for students one grade lower. This was done to ensure that the tests would not be extremely difficult for the sample, thus increasing the effects of contamination by guessing and omits. In all cases, the large-city data were compared with the regular sample data for students at the same grade. (In effect, all students included in this study took a test one level lower that would normally be assigned to their grade.) All three forms of the item analysis versions of the Reading and Language Instructional Tests were used.

Three statistical methods of detecting potential bias in test items were applied to all Reading and Language items from the Primer through Elementary levels. The three statistical methods chosen are all established methods of detecting possible item bias documented in the literature:

Angoff and Ford (1971) used the differences in item difficulties between two samples to study item-by-race interaction, assuming that the possibility of bias existed when those difficulties, transformed, normalized and plotted, were not consistent between samples. This method can be referred to as the "bivariate delta-plot" procedure, and is one of the item bias detection techniques that are referred to as item-by-group interaction procedures.

Green (1973) compared item discrimination indexes between samples, i.e., the correlation between scores on an item and total test scores. He postulated that possible bias can be shown if there are significant differences in the point-biserial discrimination indexes for the two groups.

Veale and Foreman (1975) analyzed the pattern of incorrect item responses (choice of item distractors) assuming that the possibility of item bias is strong if the pattern of wrong responses is different for the same items in the two different sample groups. This is one of the several chi square methods of detecting possible item bias.

Each item in the pool was subjected to all three statistical procedures, as well as to scrutiny by the advisory panel and the publisher's staff. Approximately 40% of the pool of items were identified as potentially biased through one of the three statistical techniques. However, there was a minimal degree of overlap among the items identified via the three procedures. For only 8% of the potentially biased items (3% of the total item pool) did at least two of the procedures agree; all three statistical procedures agreed for only .3% of the items. Further, when all potentially biased items were again submitted to the advisory panel, the members did not agree with the results of the statistical procedures in the large majority of the cases. The panelists rated no higher proportion of the statistically screened items as biased than they did a set of statistically "unbiased" items. Nevertheless, items rated by the panelists as being "Slightly Biased" or "More than Slightly Biased" were either modified or eliminated from the final tests according to the panel's recommendations. Fewer than 50 items had to be modified or eliminated.

There are several possible explanations for this lack of agreement among methods. The two strongest are that 1) the procedures, based as they are on different item characteristics, and thus on different assumptions about the nature of item bias, measure relatively unrelated factors; and 2) the three statistical procedures used in the study were not sufficiently sophisticated to address adequately the subtleties of "item bias." To reinforce and extend such a study, it would be necessary either to choose a very narrow definition of item bias, which would necessitate the use of one specific statistical method, or to use several of the other statistical methods of bias detection and add to the pool the items these methods tag as potentially biased. This would increase at least the chance of overlap among methods, and therefore increase the likelihood that items tagged as biased by multiple statistical methods might truly reflect "bias."

A research paper detailing the results of the statistical study outlined above was presented at the 1978 meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association. This paper, "An Assessment of Item 'Bias' in the 1978 Metropolitan Achievement Tests," is available on request from The Psychological Corporation.

Summary

Several reviews of the item pool for the Metropolitan Achievement Tests were conducted in order to eliminate items which appeared biased against minority groups. Items considered biased were either revised or eliminated from the preliminary version of the tests.

Three statistical procedures for the detection of possible bias were employed, as each of the methods is based on different definition of item bias, and thus taps different item characteristics. Subjective and objective judgments were combined, and the items "tagged" by any method or methods were examined once again.

One of the conclusions that may be derived from the research is that we still have an imperfect idea of the nature of item "bias." However, the combination of objective and subjective methods represents a serious attempt to eliminate items shown to exhibit any characteristic that could be looked upon as exhibiting "bias."

EXHIBIT F

GENDER BALANCE ANALYSIS OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1978 EDITION

Marjane Jensen
Indiana University

Michael D. Beck
The Psychological Corporation

Recent years have brought increased attention to gender balance in evaluation devices. Research indicates that current educational materials present males significantly more often than females, and both sexes almost exclusively in stereotypic roles. In revising the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, the publisher attempted to balance the presentation of sexes and to portray both sexes in less stereotypic roles. This study was undertaken to determine whether the revision conformed to these guidelines. Results indicate the test content is generally more balanced and less stereotypic than previous tests. Breakdowns of test content and various thematics categories are presented; data are compared across content areas and test levels.

GENDER BALANCE ANALYSIS OF THE *METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS*, 1978 EDITION

Marjane Jensen
Indiana University

Michael D. Beck
The Psychological Corporation

Beginning with a NOW publication regarding the sex-role stereotyping in public School readers (Women on Words and Images, 1972), there has been a growing body of literature concerning such stereotyping in all curriculum materials, including standardized tests. Several studies and position papers have been published in connection with the issue (e.g., Beck 1975; Educational Testing Service, 1976; Faggen-Steckler, McCarthy & Tittle, 1974; Saario, Tittle, & Jacklin, 1973).

Faggen-Steckler, et al. (1974) looked specifically at the item content of eight standardized achievement tests. Their purpose was to examine "sex imbalance as well as...stereotyped representations of women." Their measure of sex imbalance was the ratio of male nouns and pronouns to female nouns and pronouns. A balanced test would have a ratio of approximately 1.0: female nouns and pronouns should be used in items as often as male nouns and pronouns. The results show ratios ranging from .86 (more female than male references) to 14.0 (14 male references for each female reference).

In his guidelines for reducing "sex bias," Beck (1975) suggests that males and females should be represented with equal frequency within a full range of activities and vocations. Moreover, attempts should be made to use neuter references in standardized tests. This could be accomplished by use of neuter titles or generic descriptions or by re-wording gender-specific, singular phrases to form neutral, plural phrases.

Educational Testing Service (1976) and the McGraw-Hill Book Company (1974), suggest similar guidelines for their publications. ETS adds the warning that re-phrasing should not result in wording that is complex or confusing.

Current commercial achievement tests are not sufficiently unbiased in regard to sex-role references (Faggen-Steckler, et al., 1974). Therefore, as new tests are published and existing tests are revised, there will probably be increasing attention paid to sexist terminology and overtly biased attitudes. The present analysis was undertaken to determine the extent to which the 1978 edition of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) has conformed to certain guidelines for attaining a balanced representation of sexes and sex roles. The test was examined with respect to its overall gender-balance (i.e., use of gender-specific nouns and pronouns), as well as its portrayal of males and females in diverse activities.

In the final version, the 1978 MAT consists of two forms (J and K) of each of four components: Instructional Tests in Mathematics, Reading and Language and a Survey Battery. The Instructional Tests are available at six levels (Primer to Advanced 1) and the Survey is available at eight levels (Preprimer to Advanced 2). The present investigation includes only Form J of all components and levels.[1]

Procedure

All test booklets (including illustrations) of the 1978 MAT were analyzed. The test content was examined using both a quantative and a qualitative method. The quantitative method was a variation of the one used by Faggen-Steckler, et al, (1974). A tally of male nouns and pronouns, female nouns and pronouns, and neuter nouns and pronouns was made across all components and levels.

---

[1] The authors are grateful to the Psychological Corporation for allowing them access to the pre-publication materials.

Two Ratios were calculated:

1) The Gender Ratio (GR)

$$\frac{\text{Male Nouns (MN)} + \text{Male Pronouns (MP)}}{\text{Female Nouns (FN)} + \text{Female Pronouns (FP)}}$$

2) The Neuter Ratio (NR)

$$\frac{\text{Neuter Nouns (NN)} + \text{Neuter Pronouns (NP)}}{(\text{MN} + \text{MP}) + (\text{FN} + \text{FP})}$$

The authors attempted to reduce use of gender-specific terms in favor of gender-neutral terms such as "children", "people", "they", "we", etc. It was thought that the second ratio might reflect the degree of success in this effort to neutralize the language.

The qualitative analysis involved coding the test items according to four broad categories: active or passive roles and traditional and non-traditional occupations, activities, and emotions. (See Appendix A). Items were either coded in one or more category or judged to be neutral. Those judged neutral were assigned to none of the preceding categories.

The following guidelines were used for coding the written material:

1) A noun or pronoun was considered to be neuter when it was used in place of a female or male reference. For example, "people" (instead of "men")was considered a neuter noun; however references such as "the dog...it" were not considered neuter, but were omitted from the counts.

2) Each noun or pronoun was counted the first time it occurred in a passage or an item. Repeated occurrences within the same passage or in items referring to the passage were not counted as new nouns or pronouns.

3) The thematic codes (occupations, activities, roles, and emotions) were applied only to the correct responses for each item. Nouns and pronouns were counted in correct and distractor responses.

4) Boys and girls engaged in school-related activities were judged to be in male or female traditional activities.

5) References to "mother," "father," "grandmother," or "grandfather" were coded as occurrences of traditional activities for each gender.

All illustrations were coded along the same thematic dimensions. Frequency counts of males and females were made and categorized with respect to traditional or non-traditional clothing, and their physical stature (e.g., male and female figures the same height, male or female taller). (See Appendix A). A tally was also kept of children and adults in mixed-sex or same-sex groups.

The following guidelines were applied to the coding of illustrations:

1) Only the correct responses were analyzed along the thematic dimensions. All responses were included in the frequency counts of males and females, type of clothing, physical stature and group composition.

2) Physical stature was analyzed within age groups: adults compared with adults, children with children. However, if it was clear one child was drawn larger than another to indicate a difference in age, this was not coded as a difference in physical stature.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows the Gender Ratios (GR) for each level within each component of the 1978 MAT. The GR's range from .50 to 2.04 with an overall median GR of 1.02. The Instructional Mathematics Tests, with a median GR of .86, displays the greatest disparity from the optimal GR of 1.00; and the Survey Batteries (median GR of 1.11) show the greatest disproportion of males. As a whole, however, Form J of the MAT seems to have a good gender balance.

TABLE 1

Gender Ratios (GR): Male Nouns & Pronouns to Female Nouns & Pronouns by Component and Level.

Instructional Tests	$\frac{MN + MP}{FN + FP}$	GR	Median GR for Component
Mathematics			
Primer Level	13/16	.81	
Primary 1	17/21	.81	
Primary 2	21/24	.88	.81
Elementary	26/20	1.30	
Intermediate	9/15	.60	
Advanced 1	6/12	.50	
Total: Mathematics	92/108	.85	
Reading			
Primer	28/16	1.75	
Primary 1	56/59	.95	
Primary 2	46/49	.94	1.06
Elementary	47/44	1.07	
Intermediate	45/43	1.05	
Advanced 1	67/33	2.03	
Total: Reading	289/244	1.18	
Language			
Primer	30/38	.79	
Primary 1	53/36	1.47	
Primary 2	64/62	1.03	1.06
Elementary	75/74	1.01	
Intermediate	55/51	1.08	
Advanced 1	50/32	1.56	
Total: Language	327/293	1.12	

Table 1 (continued)

Complete Survey Batteries	$\frac{MN + MP}{FN + FP}$	GR	Median GR for Component
Preprimer	22/33	.66	
Primer	31/31	1.00	
Primary 1	74/61	1.21	
Primary 2	66/76	.87	1.11
Elementary	69/68	1.01	
Intermediate	63/33	1.91	
Advanced 1	64/51	1.25	
Advanced 2	47/23	2.04	
Total: Survey	436/376	1.16	

In Table 2, GR's from the 1978 MAT Survey Batteries are compared with the data presented by Faggen-Steckler, et al., (1974) for the 1970 MAT. Faggen-Steckler, et al. computed a ratio of male "regular" and "generic" nouns and pronouns to female "regular" and "generic" nouns and pronouns. They defined generic nouns and pronouns as those which "refer to males or females or to a combined group" and for which "there is only one way for referencing the noun in question" (p.153). The present analysis classified the generic terms as either male, female, or neuter based upon their pronoun reference. It appears that both methods would give essentially the same result with respect to whether a noun or pronoun was male or female. Therefore, it was concluded, that the GR's for the 1978 MAT could be compared with the data of Faggen-Steckler, et al. (1974) for the 1970 MAT. Data for comparable 1970 and 1978 levels only are shown.

The 1970 MAT had a range of ratios from .86 to 4.11 with a median of 2.95. Clearly, the 1978 MAT Survey, with a range of .87 to 1.91 and a median (based on six levels) of 1.21 shows a marked improvement.

In both editions of the MAT, there appears to be a trend toward higher GR's at the upper levels of the test. The Science and Social Studies Tests in those upper levels include biographical material about famous people in those fields.

As these achievement tests reflect current curriculum materials, which to a large extent still emphasize the contributions of men in these areas, it is almost inevitable that the tests contain biographical material mainly on men. This may partially account for the higher proportion of male references in the upper levels of the complete Survey Batteries.

TABLE 2

Gender Ratios (GR): By Level for the 1970 MAT* & 1978 MAT Survey Tests

	1970 Edition		1978 Edition	
	MN + MP / FN + FP	GR	MN + MP / FN + FP	GR
Primary 1	51/59	.86	74/61	1.21
Primary 2	137/86	1.59	66/76	.87
Elementary	124 42	2.95	69/68	1.01
Intermediate	181/44	4.11	63/33	1.91
Advanced	198/51	3.88	64/51	1.25
	Median = 2.95		Median = 1.21 (5 Levels)	
Combined Across Levels	691/282	2.45	383/312	1.23 (5 Levels)

Table 3 shows the combined GR's at each level. These combined GR's were computed by adding the number of male nouns and pronouns and the number of female nouns and pronouns across the instructional components. The Instructional Tests do not show a trend similar to the Survey of increased GR's at the upper level. This supports the hypothesis that the increased GR's in the Survey tests were a result of the Science and Social Studies items, since these two tests are found only in the Survey.

---

*1970 MAT data are from Faggen-Steckler, et al, 1974.

TABLE 3

Gender Ratios (GR): By Level of the 1978 MAT Combined Across Instructional Tests

Level	$\frac{MN + MP}{FN + FP}$	Combined GR
Primer	71/70	1.01
Primary 1	126/116	1.09
Primary 2	131/135	.97
Elementary	148/138	1.07
Intermediate	109/109	1.00
Advanced 1	123/77	1.60
Total	708/645	1.10

Since the 1978 MAT authors attempted to neutralize the language within test items, a ratio (NR) of neuter nouns and pronouns to gender-specific nouns and pronouns was computed. The NR's ranged from .16 to 1.93 and tended to increase at the upper levels. The NR's were generally lowest in the Instructional Mathematics at the Primer through Elementary levels. At those levels, there is an abundance of items of the type: "Sally had 3 apples, she ate 1. How many does she have left?". While it is possible to rephrase those items using a neuter pronoun such as "I" or "we" in place of "Sally", to do so with all items might make the test monotonous. It should also be noted that neuter terms, especially neuter job titles and generic nouns, are usually considered to be of greater reading difficulty. Therefore, since the item vocabulary must be at or below grade-level, the rephrasing of items into neuter forms is restricted in the lower levels of the test.

TABLE 4

Neuter Ratio (NR): Neuter Nouns & Pronouns to Gender-Specific Nouns and Pronouns by Component and Level.

	$\frac{NN + NP}{(MN + MP) + (FN + FP)}$	NR	Median NR for Component
Instructional Tests			
Mathematics			
Primer	6/29	.21	.43
Primary 1	18/38	.47	
Primary 2	17/45	.38	
Elementary	10/46	.22	
Intermediate	30/24	1.25	
Advanced 1	29/18	1.61	
Reading			
Primer	27/44	.61	.73
Primary 1	55/115	.48	
Primary 2	67/95	.71	
Elementary	102/91	1.12	
Intermediate	128/88	1.45	
Advanced 1	76/100	.76	
Language			
Primer	29/68	.43	.76
Primary 1	70/89	.79	
Primary 2	87/126	.69	
Elementary	108/149	.72	
Intermediate	89/106	.84	
Advanced 1	85/82	1.04	
Survey Tests			
Preprimer	9/55	.16	.92
Primer	31/62	.50	
Primary 1	107/135	.79	
Primary 2	102/142	.72	
Elementary	143/137	1.04	
Intermediate	185/96	1.93	
Advanced 1	130/115	1.13	
Advanced 2	89/70	1.27	

Table 5 lists each level across all components, with the thematic breakdown within each level. Traditional occupations, activities and emotions outnumber the nontraditional at almost every level for males and females alike.

However, it is clear that females and males are also shown in non-sterotyped occupations and activities.

The data indicates that more effort was made to balance the image of women than the image of men. For example, the ratio of females in traditional occupations to those in non-traditional ones is 26 to 28. The corresponding ratio for men is 90 to 7. The same pattern continues for the category of activities.

One encouraging result is that the ratio of female active roles to passive roles and the ratio of male active to passive roles are almost equal (2.53 and 2.41, respectively). This indicates that not all females are portrayed as passive and dependent, nor are all males seen as strong and active. In fact, females and males are both shown in active roles more than twice as often as they are shown in passive roles.

The balance is somewhat reversed in the category of emotions. The majority of males and females display sex-stereotyped emotions. However, the range of emotions expressed by males seems broader than that of women, which is in itself non-stereotypic.

TABLE 5

Breakdowns by Sex and Thematic Category of Traditional and Non-Traditional Situations by level Across Components

	Occupations				Activities			
	Female		Male		Female		Male	
	Trad	Non T	Trad	Non T	Trad	Non T	Trad	Non T
Primer	3	1	2	1	17	11	21	2
Primary 1	5	1	13	0	22	15	35	9
Primary 2	7	1	18	3	32	20	29	13
Elementary	3	3	16	0	33	20	39	20
Intermediate	5	9	22	1	18	10	21	2
Advanced 1	3	13	19	2	10	13	15	0
Totals	26	28	90	7	132	89	160	46

Table 5 (continued)

	Roles				Emotions			
	Female		Male		Female		Male	
	Active	Passive	Active	Passive	Trad	Non T	Trad	Non T
Primer	3	1	5	5	0	0	2	0
Primary 1	6	2	6	6	4	0	0	0
Primary 2	10	7	9	4	2	0	7	2
Elementary	5	3	9	1	2	2	1	0
Intermediate	6	0	2	1	1	2	4	1
Advanced 1	8	2	10	0	4	0	0	5
Totals	38	15	41	17	13	4	14	8

The thematic categories are somewhat difficult to interpret. ETS (1976) recommends that 25% or less of the items should be classifiable as "Traditional". Nevertheless, the issue can be framed in terms of whether the test ought to reflect society as it is (still with an overwhelming proportion of traditional models) or whether the test ought to show a more even distribution of non-traditional and traditional themes for women and men.

The gender balance within illustrations is summarized in Table 6. The ratios were computed for each level across components, and for each component across levels. With the exception of the Mathematics Instructional Tests, which contained very few pictures of people, the ratios of males to females are all very close to 1.00. This indicates an almost even split between female and male figures for the test as a whole and within each separate part.

TABLE 6

*Ratio of Male to Female Figures in Illustrations**

	M/F	Ratio
Component (Across Levels)		
Instructional Mathematics	3/8	.38
Instructional Reading	44/44	1.00
Instructional Language	63/54	1.17
Survey	169/140	1.21
Total	279/246	1.13
Level (Across Components)		
Primer	76/77	.99
Primary 1	118/107	1.10
Primary 2	55/40	1.38
Elementary	19/14	1.36
Total	268/238	1.13

The qualitative categories were rather inappropriate when applied to the drawings. Most drawings were not complete enough to permit an analysis of the figures' occupation, role, or emotion.

The ratios of number of females dressed traditionally to the number of females dressed non-traditionally ranged from .50 to 3.5. Most ratios (10 out of 14) were above 1.0. This could be accounted for by the fact that in today's society, dress is one of the simplest ways to discriminate between drawings of little girls and little boys.

The illustrations were coded with respect to the relative physical stature of males and females. Of the 45 drawings coded, 36 were of children and 9 were of adults. Table 7 provides a breakdown of these cases.

---

*The Intermediate, Advanced 1, and Advanced 2 levels contain no illustrations of people.

TABLE 7

Relative Pysical Stature of Male and Female Illustrations: Number of Children and Adults

	Children	Adults	Total
M taller than F	9	4	13
F taller than M	3	0	3
F same as M	24	5	29

In the majority of the illustrations, males and females of the same age were drawn as being of equal height (29 out of 45 cases.) In 13 out of 45 cases the males were taller. Among adults, such a portrayal may be true to life. However, 9 out of the 13 occurred in pictures of children. The major criticism in this area has been that boys are often shown taller than girls when, in fact, children of the same age are very similar in height regardless of sex. In only 3 cases (all among children) were females depicted as being taller than males. In cases where males and females were not portrayed as being of equal height, the 1978 MAT has persisted in the use of a physiological stereotype.

The 1978 MAT authors and editors felt it was less stereotypical to portray boys and girls and men and women in mixed sex activities. Across all levels and components, there were 63 mixed-sex groups and 20 same-sex groups. Of the same-sex groups, 10 were composed of all females and 10 were all male. If the above assumption is correct, the 1978 MAT is showing a less stereotyped image of females and males.

Conclusions

It has often been assumed that biased item content affects pupil test performance. Whether or not this is true, and if true, exactly how content affects performance, are issues which have not been dealt with adequately in research literature to date. Without such relevant information, test publishers and critics have been relying on the concept of "balance" to minimize the possibility of bias.

There is also no data with respect to what an appropriate gender-balance would be and no objective way of determining how an achievement series ought to look. Test developers have assumed an even balance should be optimal in reducing content bias.

Therefore, reducing the sex imbalance found in earlier version of the MAT was one consideration in the construction of the 1978 MAT. The present analysis indicates there is a more even balance of male and female references, and generally, a less stereotyped portrayal of both sexes in the new version of the test.

The test is not evenly nor uniformly gender-balanced across all levels and components. However, given the problems of maintaining the appropriate grade-level vocabulary and the sex-bias/sex-stereotyping that exist in the current school curriculum, the 1978 MAT is certainly a step in the right direction.

/im

EXHIBIT G

1985-86 BRANCH/AREA GOAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

District Goal: 2.0 IMPROVE INTERRACIAL/INTERCULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

Sub-Goal: 2.04 Develop and implement a procedure for reviewing system-wide tests for race and gender bias

Branch Area: Evaluation/Testing

Task No.	Task to Achieve Sub-Goal	Sub Tasks to Implement Task	Person Responsible	Start Date	Complete Date	STATUS
04.01	Establish procedure to assure that all system-wide testing materials considered for adoption (i.e. CAT, Minimum Competency, Otis Lennon and SCPP) are free of race and gender bias	.01 Conduct literature review on race and gender bias in testing	Barbadora	09-01-85	10-01-85	
		.02 Consult with major test publishers' personnel on the topic of race and gender bias in testing	Barbadora	10-01-85	12-01-85	
		.03 Adapt and/or adopt suggestions from the literature on how to assure non-bias in testing and share these with Evaluation Branch director	Barbadora	12-02-85	03-01-86	
		.04 Prepare procedures	Barbadora	03-02-86	03-30-86	
		.05 Obtain approval of Procedures from Assistant Superintendent in Curriculum and Instruction	Barbadora	04-01-86	04-15-86	
		.06 Dissemination procedures	Barbadora	05/01/86	05/07/86	

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE SENT September 13, 1985

DATE REC'D

TO Raymond J. Brokamp NAME Superintendent of Schools SCHOOL OR OFFICE

FROM Mary A. Gladden NAME Evaluation SCHOOL OR OFFICE

FILE

REGARDING Low-Achieving Schools Report

As required by the Bronson Settlement, an evaluation of the achievement gains of Low-Achieving schools has been made in reading and mathematics. The schools included in this report are Hays, Heberle, Heinold, Hoffman, Rothenberg, Washington Park, and Windsor. A more detailed report including survey data will be available soon. The achievement results are summarized below.

MAJOR FINDINGS

A. Students in low-achieving schools made larger achievement gains in reading and mathematics than the average gains for students across the system during the 1984-85 school year.

Supporting Data

- Overall, the percentage of students achieving at or above the national norm increased 4.7% in reading in low-achieving schools, compared with an increase of 0.8% for all students grades 1-6. (See Table 1.)
- Overall, the percentage of students achieving at or above the national norm increased 2.2% in mathematics in low-achieving schools compared with an increase of 0.3% for all students grades 1-6. (See Table 1.)
- The average NCE gain in reading was -0.9 for low-achieving schools compared to the value of -1.5 for all students grades 1-6. (See Table 3.)
- The average NCE gain in mathematics was +0.2 in low-achieving schools compared to the value of -0.9 for all students grades 1-6. (See Table 3.)

B. Low-achieving schools as a group made considerable progress toward the stated program objective in reading while smaller but positive improvements were made in mathematics during the 1984-85 school year.

Supporting Data

- The stated program objective in reading calls for an increase of 15% in the percentage of students achieving at or above the national norm over a three year period of time.

The average gain for the seven low-achieving schools on this objective was 4.7% for the first year. (See Table 1.)

- The stated program objective in mathematics calls for an increase of 10% in the percentage of students achieving at or above the national norm over a three year period of time. The average gain for the seven low-achieving schools on this objective was 2.2% for the first year. (See Table 1.)

C. Since 1983, when these seven schools were selected on the basis of their percentage of students at or above the national norm in reading, they have made great improvement.

- Supporting Data

- Overall, the percentage of students achieving at or above the national norm increased 10.9% in reading in low-achieving schools compared with an increase of 6.1% for all students grades 1-6. (See Table 2.)

- Overall, the percentage of students achieving at or above the national norm increased 10.9% in mathematics in low-achieving schools compared with an increase of 7.9% for all students grades 1-6. (See Table 2.)

D. Despite the progress that has been made, most of the seven low-achieving schools still rank near the bottom among all ementary schools.

Supporting Data

- Five of seven schools (Hays, Heberle, Heinold, Rothenberg and Windsor) continue to be among the lowest-achieving schools in reading.

- Five of seven schools (Heinold, Hoffman, Rothenberg, Washington Park, and Windsor) continue to be among the lowest-achieving schools in mathematics.

MAG/mr

cc. Robert Evans
Adoria Perkins
Shirlee Williams
John Clark
Ruth Wernersbach
Major McNeil
Willis Holloway
Vella Ellis
William Dupree
Frank Fields
Thomas Haley
Jerry Mitchell
LAST Principals

Table 1. Comparison of Percent At And Above the National Norm For Low Achieving Schools, 1984 to 1985.

School	Percentage of Students At And Above National Norm 1984	1985	Gain
		Reading	
Hays	26.0%	28.7%	2.7%
Heberle	25.3	32.5	7.2
Hoffman	37.3	43.3	6.0
Heinold	27.6	28.9	1.3
Rothenberg	22.4	27.4	5.0
Washington Park	23.2	35.5	12.3
Windsor	27.8	24.2	-3.6
Average Value	26.8%	31.5%	4.7%
System Average (Grades 1-6)	52.6%	53.4%	0.8%
		Mathematics	
Hays	40.7%	48.6%	7.9%
Heberle	46.6	45.4	-1.2
Hoffman	39.7	37.9	-1.8
Heinold	38.8	40.0	1.2
Rothenberg	22.4	29.6	7.2
Washington Park	39.1	39.0	-0.1
Windsor	28.4	35.0	6.6
Average Value	37.0%	39.3%	2.2%
System Average (Grades 1-6)	58.1%	58.4%	0.3%

Table 2. Comparison of Percent At And Above the National Norm For Low Achieving Schools, 1983 to 1985.

School	Percentage of Students At And Above National Norm 1983	1985	Gain
		Reading	
Hays	18.5%	28.7%	10.2%
Heberle	23.2	32.5	9.3
Hoffman	15.8	43.3	27.5
Heinold	14.9	28.9	14.0
Rothenberg	17.3	27.4	10.1
Washington Park	26.8	35.5	8.7
Windsor	23.2	24.2	1.0
Average Value	20.6%	31.5%	10.9%
System Average	47.3%	53.4%	6.1%
		Mathematics	
Hays	28.5%	48.6%	20.1%
Heberle	37.2	45.4	8.2
Hoffman	14.3	37.9	23.6
Heinold	34.1	40.0	5.9
Rothenberg	19.0	29.6	10.6
Washington Park	38.8	39.0	0.2
Windsor	23.1	35.0	11.9
Average Value	28.4%	39.3%	10.9%
System Average	50.5%	58.4%	7.9%

Table 3. Achievement Status and Gains in Reading and Math for Low-Achieving Schools, Matched and Promoted Students, 1984-85.

School	Total Reading			Total Math		
	Avg. NCE 1984	Avg. NCE 1985	NCE Gain*	Ave. NCE 1984	Avg. NCE 1985	NCE Gain*
Hays	42.2	42.0	-0.2	43.8	51.1	+7.3
Heberle	43.6	41.9	-1.7	50.1	48.9	-1.2
Hoffman	46.4	44.3	-2.1	48.7	45.1	-3.6
Heinold	45.3	43.2	-2.1	47.4	44.5	-2.9
Rothenberg	39.6	38.8	-0.8	38.9	38.8	-0.1
Washington Park	42.4	44.6	+2.2	45.3	47.6	+2.3
Windsor	43.6	41.0	-2.6	42.3	42.8	+0.5
Averages for Low-Achieving Schools	43.2	42.3	-0.9	45.4	45.6	+0.2
Averages for System (Grades 2-6)	53.7	52.2	-1.5	55.4	54.5	-0.9

*Gains can be reported only for students in grades 2 through 6.

Table 4. System-wide Achievement* Rank Changes in Low-Achieving Schools, April, 1983 to March - April, 1985.

School	1983	1985	Change 1983-1985
	Reading Achievement Rank		
Hoffman	1	17	+16
Rothenberg	2	2	0
Hays	3	3	0
Heinold	4	4	0
Heberle	5	6	+1
Windsor	6	1	-5
Washington Park	7	10	+3
	Mathematics Achievement Rank		
Hoffman	1	4	+3
Rothenberg	2	1	-1
Hays	3	18	+15
Heinold	4	7	+3
Heberle	5	14	+9
Windsor	7	2	-5
Washington Park	18	6	-12

* Achievement rank is based on the percentage of students scoring at or above the national median on the California Achievement Test. The ranking is made from low (a rank of 1) to high (a rank of 57) for all elementary schools.

Table 5. Systemwide Achievement Rank Changes in Low-Achieving Schools, April, 1984 to March - April, 1985.

School	1984	1985	Changes 1984-1985
		Reading Achievement Rank	
Hoffman	11	17	+6
Rothenberg	1	2	+1
Hays	4	3	-1
Heinold	5	4	-1
Heberle	3	6	+3
Windsor	6	1	-5
Washington Park	2	10	+8
		Mathematics Achievement Rank	
Hoffman	8	4	-4
Rothenberg	1	1	0
Windsor	2	2	0
Heberle	17	14	-3
Heinold	6	7	+1
Hays	9	18	+9
Washington Park	7	6	-1

* Achievement rank is based on the percentage of students scoring at or above the national median on the California Achievement Test. The ranking is made from low (a rank of 1) to high (a rank of 57) for all elementary schools.

APPENDIX G

APPENDIX G

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DATE SENT 8/4/85

DATE REC'D

TO Raymond J. Brokamp, Superintendent of Schools
NAME SCHOOL OR OFFICE

FROM Betty Elsey
NAME SCHOOL OR OFFICE

FILE

REGARDING Preliminary Findings of the Extra Curricular Activities Study, 1984-85

The data derived from this study are still being reviewed and analyzed and will be available soon. However, these preliminary findings may be of interest to you and might suggest other avenues for investigation.

A. The questions addressed by this study were -

1. In the secondary schools, are transfer students as likely to participate in extra curricular activities as the students who are attending their neighborhood school?
2. Secondly, is the racial distribution of transfer and neighborhood students maintained among those participating in the extra curricular activities?

Transfer students were considered alternative and open enrollment students. Walnut Hills High School students were also considered transfer students for the purpose of this study. The extra curricular activities considered were those for which there was a paid sponsor and which met before or after school hours. Secondary students grade 7-12, and grade 6 students at Schiel were the subjects of this study. The sponsors completed rosters of student names and I.D.'s and returned these to the Evaluation Branch by the end of May.

B. Preliminary findings (See tables attached)

Table 1:

a. A greater percentage of transfer students (41%) participate in extra curricular activities than do neighborhood students (25%).

b. Slightly less than a third (31%) of all secondary students participate in at least one extra curricular activity.

Table 2:

a. At least 43% of the Alternative School students participate in extra curricular activities.

b. Of the secondary schools with mixed enrollment, i.e., neighborhood, alternative program and open enrollment students, the alternative/open enrollment students participate in extra curricular activities to a greater degree (40%) than neighborhood students (28%).

c. Of the secondary schools with neighborhood and open enrollment students only, the participation in extra curricular activities does not differ markedly (22% open enrollment to 23% neighborhood).

Table 3:

a. Of the total number of black neighborhood students, 27% participate in activities before or after school. Of the total number of white neighborhood students 22% participate.

b. 45% of the black alternative/open enrollment students participate in extra curricular activities while 39% of the white students participate.

c. Considering, all students, neighborhood and transfer, a slightly higher percentage of black students participate in extra curricular activities (32%) than white students (29%).

C. General Conclusions

1. From this preliminary analysis it would appear that the percent participation in extra curricular activities is greater for transfer students (41%) than neighborhood students (25%).

2. For neighborhood students, alternative/open enrollment and all students combined, a slightly higher percent of black students participate in after-school activities than the black representation in the population would suggest - e.g., alternative /open enrollment students:
   52% of these students are black.
   57% of the alternative/open enrollment students participating are black.

cc: Robert Evans
Joe Gastright
Adoria Perkins

Table 1 : The Number of Middle, Junior, and Senior High Neighborhood and Alternative Program Students who Participated in Extra Curricular Activities during the 1984-85 School Year.

	Neighborhood Students	Open Enrollment and Alternative Students*	Total
Participants	3347	2950	6297
Non-Participants	10028	4191	14219
Total	13375	7141	20516
Percent Participating in Extra Curricular Activities	25%	41%	31%

* Walnut Hills Students are also included here for the purpose of this study.

Table 2 : The Number and Percent of Students who Participated in Extra Curricular Activities by School and by Enrollment Status - Neighborhood Student or Alternative Program Student.

	TOTAL STUDENTS			NEIGHBORHOOD STUDENTS			ALTERNATIVE STUDENTS		
SCHOOLS	#Students	#Participating	%Participating	#Students	#Participating	%Participating	#Students	#Participating	%Participating
Alternative Schools									
CAFE (7-12)*	859	423	49%	---	---	---	859	423	49%
SCPA (7-12)	851	694	82%	---	---	---	851	694	82%
Eastern Hills (7-8)	240	52	22%	---	---	---	240	52	22%
Heinold (7-8)	195	84	43%	---	---	---	195	84	43%
Schiel C.B.A. (6-8)	383	121	32%	---	---	---	383	121	32%
Other									
Walnut Hills (7-12)**	2371	734	31%	---	---	---	2371	734	31%
TOTAL	4899	2108	43%	0	0	0	4899	2108	43%
Mixed: Alternative and Open Enrollment/Neighborhood Schools							Alternative and Open Enrollment		
Hughes (9-12)	1077	325	30%	889	283	32%	188	42	22%
Withrow (9-12)	1944	542	28%	1455	364	25%	489	178	36%
Woodward (7-12)	1460	454	31%	1035	225	22%	425	229	54%

Dater (7-9)	763	228	30%	506	156	31%	257	72	28%
Peoples (7-8)	641	191	30%	533	155	29%	108	36	33%
Porter (7-9)	410	176	43%	256	88	34%	154	88	57%
Schwab (7-8)	911	268	29%	796	217	27%	115	51	44%
Shroder (7-9)	356	143	40%	295	120	41%	61	23	38%

Roselawn/Condon (7-12)	193	72	37%	100	27	27%	93	45	48%
TOTAL	7755	2399	31%	5865	1635	28%	1890	764	40%
Mixed: Open Enrollment/Neighborhood Schools							Open Enrollment Students		
Aiken (9-12)	1590	250	16%	1585	248	16%	5	2	40%
Taft (10-12)	643	137	21%	642	137	21%	1	0	0%
Western Hills (9-12)	2264	385	17%	1967	341	17%	297	44	15%
Bloom (7-9)	582	187	32%	581	186	32%	1	1	100%
Crest Hills (7-8)	541	112	21%	541	112	21%	0	0	0%
Gamble (7-8)	559	164	29%	554	162	29%	5	2	40%
Merry (7-8)	532	131	25%	530	129	24%	2	2	100%
Roberts (7-9)	766	304	40%	728	280	38%	38	24	63%
Sawyer (7-9)	385	120	31%	382	117	31%	3	3	100%
TOTAL	7862	1790	23%	7510	1712	23%	352	78	22%
GRAND TOTAL	20516	6297	31%	13375	3347	25%	7141	2950	41%

---

*Grades included in study.
**For the purposes of this study, Walnut Hills is being considered an alternative school.

Table 3 : Number and Percent of Students Participating in Extra Curricular Activities by Race and Enrollment Type - Neighborhood Student, Alternative or Open Enrollment Student.

Race	Total Population			Neighborhood Students			Alternative/Open Enrollment Students		
	# Students	# Participating	% Participating	# Students	# Participating	% Participating	# Students	# Participating	% Participating
Black	12316	3975	32%	8575	2307	27%	3741	1668	45%
Other	273	51	19%	80	13	16%	193	38	20%
White	7926	2270	29%	4719	1026	22%	3207	1244	39%
TOTAL	20515	6297	31%	13374	3347	25%	7141	2950	41%
	·Of All Students 60% = Black 39% = White ·Of All Students Participating in Extra Curricular Activities 63% = Black 36% = White			·Of All Neighborhood Students 64% = Black 35% = White ·Of All Neighborhood Students Participating in Extra Curricular Activities 69% = Black 31% = White			·Of All Alternative/Open Enrollment Students 52% = Black 45% = White ·Of All Alternative/Open Enrollment Students Participating in Extra Curricular Activities 57% = Black 42% = White		